EXHIBIT D

Certified Criminal Trial Transcript of *State of Indiana v. Lana R. Canen*, Elkhart Circuit Court, Cause No. 20C01-0309-MR-155

MONDAY, AUGUST 8, 2005

(The Court convened with all the

parties present.)

1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: State of Indiana versus Andrew Royer, State of Indiana versus Lana Canen. 03-MR-155 is Mr. Royer's case. 04-MR-118 is Ms. Canen's case. record should reflect, each defendant appears with their respective counsel. Mr. Zook is here with Ms. Canen. Mr. Crawford is here with Mr. Royer. State appears by Chief Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Vicki Elaine Becker and Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Joel Williams. They'll be assisted by Detective Daggy of the Elkhart Police Department.

The record in this action reflects this cause was set for trial as a joint trial. Parties, by their counsel, have informed me there are no Bruton Rule issues. We have had a filing today of a supplement to the state's witness list in Mr. Royer's case. You have copy of that, Mr. Crawford?

MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. We have also a motion in limine filed by Ms. Canen's counsel. Arguments of counsel have been heard with respect to that. Motion in limine has been granted without objection by the state. The event we touch on such area or it becomes an issue in

```
the trial, Mr. Williams Mr. Becker, would you approach
 1
      the bench, and we'll make arrangements to remove the jury
 2
      from the courtroom to address whatever issue we need to
 3
      address. Ms. Canen, would you raise your right hand.
 4
                     (The defendant was sworn.)
                MS. CANEN: So help me God.
 6
                THE COURT: Tell me your name.
 7
                MS. CANEN: Lana Rae Canen.
 8
 9
                THE COURT: Mr. Royer, raise your right hand,
10
      please.
                     (The defendant was sworn.)
11
12
                MR. ROYER: So help me God.
13
                THE COURT: Tell me your name, sir.
14
                MR. ROYER: Andy Royer.
                THE COURT: The record also reflects a
15
      conference call was conducted amongst all counsel and the
16
17
      Court last week. An amended charge was filed joining
      both defendants in the charge of felony murder. It was
18
19
      agreed amongst counsel that we would proceed to trial on
2.0
      felony murder against both defendants. Is that correct,
      Mr. Crawford?
21
22
                MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, your Honor.
23
                THE COURT: And, Mr. Zook.
24
                MR. ZOOK: Yes, sir.
25
                THE COURT: And we also talked about an initial
```

```
hearing, and it was my understanding that we were going
 1
 2
      to waive the initial hearing. Is that correct,
 3
      Mr. Crawford?
                MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, your Honor.
 4
                THE COURT: And, Mr. Zook?
 5
                MR. ZOOK: Yes, sir.
 6
 7
                THE COURT: All right. A not guilty plea has
      been entered for each defendant. We are here for trial.
 8
      Has all discovery been completed, Ms. Becker?
 9
10
                MS. BECKER: Yes, your Honor, to my knowledge
      it has.
11
12
                THE COURT: And, Mr. Crawford?
13
                MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, your Honor.
14
                THE COURT: And, Mr. Zook?
15
                MR. ZOOK: As far as I know.
                THE COURT: The defendants have each disclosed
16
17
      to the Court they're going to employ the defense of they
      did not do this particular offense. Put the state to its
18
      burden of proof. Are we ready to proceed to trial, Mr.
19
2.0
      Zook?
21
                MR. ZOOK: Yes.
                THE COURT: And, Mr. Crawford?
22
23
                MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, your Honor.
24
                THE COURT: Ms. Becker?
25
                MS. BECKER: Yes, your Honor.
```

THE COURT: If you want to be sure something is in the record, you'll need to let us know so we can make arrangements with the court reporter. Bench conferences is what I'm talking about.

2.0

(The prospective jury entered the courtroom, and the following proceedings were had.)

THE COURT: Be seated, please. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I'm Judge Shewmaker of the Elkhart Circuit Court. I'll be presiding during this trial. For trial this morning, is a criminal case in which the defendants, there are two of them, are seated at the table to my left. Mr. Andrew M. Royer is one of the defendants. Ms. Lana Canen is the other defendant Mr. Royer is represented by Mr. Christopher Crawford.

MR. CRAWFORD: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

THE COURT: And Ms. Canen is represented by Mr. Brent Zook. In this case, the State of Indiana has brought this charge of murder. These charges have been brought by a representative of the State of Indiana and that is Chief Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Vicki Elaine Becker. She's seated at counsel table to my right. She'll be assisted by Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Joel Williams. They will be assisted by Detective Daggy of

the Elkhart Police Department.

2.0

2.5

In a criminal case, any defendant is presumed to be innocent of the charges brought against him or her. State of Indiana has the burden of overcoming this presumption of innocence and proving each defendant guilty of the crime beyond a reasonable. I will discuss these concepts with you at greater length later in these proceedings.

You have been chosen randomly according to law to serve as a juror from certain lists of county residents.

This call for jury service may require some sacrifice of a personal or business nature; however, it does not come to you frequently. Jury service represents one of the most important duties that citizens are asked to perform. The jury system could not function without the assistance of capable citizens who are willing to accept this responsibility. Your service as a juror is an assurance to every citizen of his right to make a defense to a criminal charge or to contest a civil dispute in open court or to have the facts regarding such matters considered and determined by a jury of his or her peers.

While some of you may have had previous experience as a juror, I know that jury service may seem

strange to most of you. As a consequence, I would like to make a few preliminary remarks, which may be helpful to you. A short explanation of the procedure used in selecting a jury is in order since the first step in any trial by jury in either a criminal or civil case is the selection of an impartial jury. All of those who participate in a trial must do so according to established rules. This is equally true of jurors.

All of the parties are entitled to a jury made up of people who will approach this case with open minds and who will agree to keep their minds open until a verdict is reached.

Jurors must be as free as humanly possible from bias, prejudice, or sympathy and must not be influenced by preconceived ideas either as to the facts or the law.

During the first step of selecting the jury, the Court and counsel will ask you questions concerning your competency and qualifications to serve as a juror in this case. This is called voir dire examination of prospective jurors. Voir dire is a French phrase which means "to speak the truth." These questions must be answered fully, frankly and accurately. If a prospective juror thinks that he or she may be disqualified for any reason not brought out by our questions, he or she should tell us about it.

Under the law, lawyers are within their rights in asking questions to test a juror's state of mind and qualifications. The questions asked each of you are not intended to satisfy idle curiosity or to embarrass you in any way.

2.0

In the process of jury selection, some jurors may be excused for cause. Such challenges will be made individually as we proceed. There is no numeric limit to the number of challenges for cause which a lawyer may make. I will rule on each challenge for cause individually.

In addition, the law permits counsel to excuse a certain number of jurors without giving any reason. In this case, that number is ten. No juror who is excused should feel that counsel or the Court is in any way critical of that juror. The selection of the jury is an art rather than a science. Lawyers often accept or reject potential jurors purely on instinct.

Occasionally, during the course of a trial, a juror or prospective juror may have some concerns or questions which he or she wishes to raise with me without stating them aloud in open court. These questions or concerns may be brought to my attention in a note which should be given to the bailiff at the earliest opportunity. The bailiff will convey that note to me.

Please understand that I must share this note with the lawyers and the parties.

2.0

After this is accomplished, I will address the issue raised by the juror. In doing so, I will attempt to accommodate both the juror's desire for privacy and the rights of the parties.

The jury, when selected, will consist of regular members and one or more alternate jurors who will serve in the event that a regular member is excused for illness or for some other reason during the trial.

After a jury is selected and sworn, the Court will read preliminary instructions on the law as it applies to this case. The prosecutor will then give an outline of the state's case in what is called an opening statement. The defendant will then have an opportunity to give an opening statement, but is not required do so.

The opening statements are not evidence. They are merely a preview of the case and are designed to help you follow the case as it is presented.

After this phase of the trial, the State of Indiana will present evidence. The defendant follows with the presentation of such evidence as he or she desires. The defendants are under no obligation to present any evidence whatsoever. The lawyers are required to present evidence according to rules of law.

I enforce these rules and determine what evidence may be admitted.

2.0

2.5

There may be objections to an exhibit offered into evidence or to a question asked. Under the rules, a lawyer has the duty and is within his or her rights to object to the attempted introduction of any evidence which he or she believes is not proper. If I agree, the objection will be sustained. This keeps the evidence out of the case. If I think that the lawyer is mistaken, I will overrule the objection and this ruling permits that evidence to become part of the case.

Objections by the lawyers and rulings by the Court with regard to those objections should not cause the jurors to take sides.

There may be times during the trial when the jury is excused and retires to the jury room so that the Court may hear the arguments of the lawyers on a point of law. The lawyers may also approach the bench and have a conference with the Court. The purpose of those procedures is to secure a ruling from the Court as to some matter relating to the trial, which under the rules, may not be discussed in the presence of the jury.

The trial concludes with arguments of counsel and final instructions of law by the Court. The arguments of counsel are not evidence. Those arguments

often summarize the evidence from the perspective of the party making the argument and urge jurors to adopt a particular point of view. The jury may accept or reject those arguments as it sees fit.

2.0

After the lawyers have concluded their final arguments, I will give you further instructions on the law of Indiana as it applies to this case.

The jury will then retire to the jury room to deliberate upon its verdict which must be unanimous. The jury shall not be permitted to separate during deliberation in a criminal case unless the parties consent to the separation.

You are all prospective jurors in this case.

You are prohibited from discussing this case with anyone prior to the commencement of the evidentiary portion of the trial. To do so may result in a mistrial. After the presentation of evidence has begun, juror may discuss the evidence presented amongst themselves in the jury room during recesses. All regular jurors and alternates must be present during such discussion and you must reserve judgement concerning the outcome of the case until jury deliberations begin.

You may not discuss the facts of this case with me or with the lawyers or with any of the witnesses.

You may not investigate yourself or attempt to

obtain information outside the courtroom. It is highly improper for you to do so. You are also prohibited from reading and newspaper accounts of this case and from listening to or watching and radio or television reports relating to this trial. You are to consider and decide this case only upon the evidence received during the course of the trial her in the courtroom.

2.0

Our schedule for trial is generally as follows: We'll try to begin by 8:30 a.m, which means you need to be here by 8:15 a.m. We'll try to break for lunch at approximately 12 o'clock noon and resume the trial at approximately 1:30 p.m. We try to break for the evening at approximately 5:00 p.m.

Those of you who are called as jurors but do not serve will be paid a per diem and mileage for travel expenses. For those of you who are called as jurors and do serve, you'll receive a hire per diem and also receive a mileage allowance. At the conclusion of the trial, a list will be prepared and submitted to the County Auditor. You will receive a check from the auditor thereafter.

If you need statements verifying your service as a juror for your employer, you should make that fact known to the bailiff or to me. Such a statement will be provided to you.

When we have a recess or adjourn for lunch or overnight, those of you who are in the jury box, please remember your seating arrangements in the box and take the same chair each time you return.

Once the jury has been selected, during recesses or retiring for lunch, please go to the jury room at the start of the recess and remain in that room unless you leave for lunch or are excused by the Court. The bailiff will conduct you into the courtroom at the appropriate time.

The law requires that prospective jurors be sworn before any questions are asked. Would all of you please rise, hold up your right hand, and face me. I will administer the oath to you.

(The prospective jury venire was sworn.)

THE COURT: Be seated. Certain persons are not eligible for jury service. To serve as a juror, a person must be a citizen of the United States; at least 18 years of age; a resident of this county; able to read, speak, and understand the English language; not be suffering from a physical or mental disability that prevents him or her from rendering satisfactory jury service; not under a guardianship appointment because of mental incapacity; not a person who has had rights to vote revoked by reason

```
of a felony conviction and whose rights to vote have not
 1
      been restored; an not a law enforcement officer if the
 2
      trial is for a criminal case.
 3
                A person may claim exemption from jury service
 4
      if they've completed a term of jury service in the
 5
      preceding two years. Do any of you state that you are
 6
 7
      disqualified? I see no such indications.
                In the jury box, let's see if we can identify
 8
      persons present in seat number No. 1 we have Ms. Tullis.
 9
10
                A JUROR: Yes.
                THE COURT: In seat No. 2 we have Judith Clark.
11
12
                A JUROR: Yes.
13
                THE COURT: In seat No. 3, we have Mr. Ball.
14
                A JUROR: Yes.
15
                THE COURT: In seat No. 4, we have Ms. Cramer.
16
                A JUROR: Yes.
17
                THE COURT: In seat No. 5, Mr. Emerson.
                A JUROR: Yes.
18
19
                THE COURT: In seat No. 6, Mr. Yoder.
2.0
                A JUROR: Yes.
                THE COURT: In seat No. 7, Ms. Brown.
21
                A JUROR: Yes.
22
23
                THE COURT: In seat No. 8, Mr. Hoffman.
24
                A JUROR: That's correct.
25
                THE COURT: In seat No. 9, Ms. Peachey.
```

```
A JUROR: Yes.
 1
               THE COURT: In seat No. 10, Mr. Miller.
 2
 3
               A JUROR: Yes.
               THE COURT: In seat No. 11, Ms. Oakley.
 4
               A JUROR: Yes.
                THE COURT: And in seat No. 12, Mr. Enos.
 6
 7
               A JUROR: Yes.
                THE COURT: All right. Those of you seated in
 8
      the audience section, those of you seated in the jury
 9
10
      box. I have introduced the participants. I've
      introduced myself. Are any of you acquainted with any of
11
12
      the persons I have introduced to you today? Yes,
13
      Ms. Oakley.
14
                A JUROR: I believe I know Lana, but I don't
      know her by that last name.
15
16
                THE COURT: Okay. You believe you know Ms.
17
      Canen, one of the defendants. All right. Anyone else?
      Yes, sir. Tell me your name, please.
18
19
                A JUROR: Daniel Bontrager. My parents are
20
      best friends with Lana's brother, so I've known her all
21
      my life.
                THE COURT: All right. Anyone else? Yes.
22
23
                A JUROR: The lady on the end, I think I know
24
      her. I've seen her.
25
                THE COURT: That would be Ms. Canen.
```

A JUROR: Yes. 1 2. THE COURT: In the black sport coat. 3 A JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: Anyone else? If not, we're going 4 to commence the formal jury selection process at this 5 time. State of Indiana has the burden of proof. It's 6 7 for that reason the State of Indiana will address you both first and last. 8 MS. BECKER: May we approach, your Honor. 10 (An off-the-record discussion was held at the bench.) 11 12 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, in an effort 13 to expedite these proceedings, we're going to permit 14 counsel to make a three minute preliminary opening statement to tell you about the facts of this case. That 15 hopefully will eliminate the need to talk about the facts 16 of the case during the formal jury selection process. 17 18 Ms. Becker. 19 MS. BECKER: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, 20 ladies and gentlemen. This case is a little bit 21 different due to the fact we have several individuals involved as witnesses in this case that are individuals 22 23 who may have a little bit of a diminished mental 24 capability. Nothing that rises to the level of a legal defense; however, it is something that you will notice 25

using your common sense. It is not a legal issue in this case. It is not a defense in this case.

2.0

We will be asking you questions during voir dire for the purpose of making sure you don't have any sympathies towards that. Specifically, I'm talking about individuals who lived at the Waterfall Highrise. This is a government housing facility in Elkhart that basically to live there you have to qualify as having some kind of a mental or physical disability. This is going to be evidence in this case. And while is doesn't really control the evidence, it is something we need to get out there. In addition to that, you're going to have to hear testimony from individuals who's perceptions and whose memory have also faded just a little bit due to the time of this case. These are issues we'll be talking about during voir dire.

Ladies and gentlemen, this occurred on

Thanksgiving day of 2002. It is a murder. A 94-year-old

woman was brutally strangled in her apartment and was

left there to die. The defendant Andy Royer is the

individual that strangled her physically. Lana Canen was

to brains behind the operation. Once you see the

evidence, you will understand why all this is coming in;

but you can't see evidence until after you're selected as

a juror. Therefore, for purposes of voir dire, we want

```
to make sure you a have a thumb nail sketch of what this
 1
      is all about because, folks, what it comes down to is
 3
      money, and that what's it's about.
                It's called felony murder when someone kills
 4
      another human being in the commission of a felony. Lana
 5
      Canen and Andy Royer went to Helen's apartment for the
 6
 7
      purpose of getting money from her, for robbing her. And
      at the same time, they took some pills from her. This is
 8
      where the robbery comes in; and because someone died
 9
10
      during the commission of this, it's charged felony
      murder. All of these things we'll be discussing during
11
12
      voir dire. But, once again, we wanted to make sure that
13
      you understood a little bit more about the evidence.
14
      Thank you.
15
                THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Becker.
16
                MR. ZOOK: I'll waive the argument.
                MR. CRAWFORD: I'll waive is as well.
17
                THE COURT: Each defendant has waived their
18
      preliminary three minute opening. Now we will commence
19
2.0
      the formal process. Ms. Becker.
21
                MS. BECKER: Thank you, Your Honor.
                        VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
22
23
      BY MS. BECKER:
24
           Hello again. Okay. First thing I want you to
25
            know, we want you to know, is that this process of
```

2.0

voir dire is the only opportunity that you will have to talk one on one with any of us as far as the lawyers are concerned. This process is what we go through in order to ensure that we have a fair and impartial jury in this case. Nobody wants to have a situation where you guys might have some sympathies toward one side or against the other. You have got to be honest with us. Some of these questions may seem like they're prying. We are not trying to. We have to do this business as efficiently as we can so you've got to be honest.

So if I don't ask the right question or Mr. Williams or Mr. Crawford or Mr. Zook but yet it comes close to something that's bothering you, let us know. We don't always ask the right questions. So volunteer that information so we know that we're all trying get the most out here. Everybody agree you can do that? Yes. No. Okay.

You're also going to have to speak audibly.

All right. That double word there. The reason
being is she is taking down everything that is
being said. And while I will try to mention your
names as I'm asking individuals questions, you'll
understand why we're doing some of the things we're
doing because she's recording everything. So make

sure you answer me audibly instead of uh-huh or uh-uh or something along those lines. Everybody understand that?

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

(The jurors answered in the affirmative.)

Perfect. Okay. Now we're through housekeeping. I want to identify individuals who may be witnesses in this case that way if you recognize any names you can let us know, and then we can inquire further need be. These are in no particular order. They would cover both sides James Cassity, Brett Canen, Martha Haff, Louis Burnett, Detective Todd Thayer from Elkhart Police Department, Larry Haack Martin Supermarket, Walter also known as "Skip" Miller from Elkhart County Sheriff's Department Caroline Hoffer, Carol Converse, Larry Converse, Erica Roarhig, Jerome Matthew Johnson, Christopher Kinsey, Judy Johnson, Mary Jane Dejong, Detective Dennis Chapman. Dr. Joseph Prahlow, Dr. Jeff Landrum county coroner, Detective Lieutenant Peggy Snider, Detective Mark Daggy, who is the detective seated here with us, Detective Joel Bourdon, Larry Wood, Florence Macioce, Nina Porter, Mike Berger, Detective Carl Conway, Charlie Lambert, Geneva West, or Betty Cross from EPD.

Any of these names sound familiar? Yes, sir. 1 Yes. Detective Thayer. I used to work out with 2 3 him in the gym. Detective Thayer you used to work out with. How 4 Q 5 long ago? Probably eight years. 6 Α Eight years ago. Since then have you spent any 7 Q significant time with Detective Thayer? 8 9 Α No. 10 0 All right. This crime occurred in 2002. It was 11 after you had been working out together. Based 12 upon your relationship or your acquaintance with 13 Detective Thayer, if he were a witness in this 14 case, would you give him any more or less credibility than you would anybody else? 15 16 Α No. 17 Okay. Thank you very much. Any of those names sound familiar to anyone else? Okay. I probably 18 won't read the list of names of again, but those 19 20 who are in the audience right now when you come to, the box the first thing I need you to let us know 21 is if you recognized any of these people. Thank 22 23 you. 24 Okay. Let's move on. Spent five minutes. 25 I'm going to go as quick as we can but, folks, this is the most boring and long process that you're going to go through. Incredibly important, but it does take a lot of time. So we have 12 individuals, and I need to ask quite a few generic questions to begin with.

2.0

First of all, how many of you know what the crime of felony murder is defined at in the State of Indiana; or based upon what I said a little while ago, think you can tell me again what I said? Anybody? Mrs. Brown, you're shaking your head. Okay. What -- what can you tell me about felony murder?

- A You said it was in -- the murder was committed, and it started out as a robbery, turned into a murder, and that's why it's a felony murder.
- Q Okay. Now, let me ask you folks this. You know, you got this plan in your head, you're going to go in, and you're going to commit a crime. Let's -- I hate to use a bank robbery because it just happened, but, you know, that's something that all of us are familiar. Let's use robbery of a 7-Eleven. Okay. Mrs. Brown, you're a clerk at the 7-Eleven. All right. And Ms. Clark and I decide we're going to go in, and we're going to rob that 7-Eleven. All right.

I'm carrying a gun, but I'm staying in the car. I'm going to be the get-away driver. Mrs. Clark is also carrying a pipe. Okay. Now, you're the clerk, Mrs. Clark scopes things out, goes into the 7-Eleven, she threatens you to give you the money out of the cash register, and then she beats you in the head with a pipe. Okay. Make sense so far. Okay.

Now, she grabs the money out of the register, take off, and I'm out in the car and then we zoom away and we committed the robbery. Now, you got hit pretty hard with that lead pipe, and it actually fractured your skull and caused all kinds of hemorrhaging in your brain and you die. That's felony murder, folks.

Does that make sense? Does anybody think that's not fair that it's still murder because you didn't mean to go in there and kill her.

Mrs. Clark, what do you think? Is it fair?

- A Yes, I believe it is.
- Q Okay. Does anybody feel uncomfortable with that concept? Let me know now so we can talk about it a little bit more or no. Ms. Tullis, what about you?
- A I agree.

Q You agree. Okay. Mr. Ball?

Yes, I agree. 1 Α Ms. Cramer? 2 3 Α Yes. Mr. Emerson? 4 5 Α Yes. Mr. Yoder, what about you? 6 Q 7 Α Yes. Anybody in the back got any problems with that? Do 0 8 you think it's the right thing to do to hold people 9 10 accountable for the consequences of their actions even if they're more severe than what they a 11 12 intended? 13 (The jurors answered in the 14 affirmative.) All right. Very good. Then let's go on and move 15 to second legal principle that's going to be 16 present in this case. All right. And that is 17 called accessory liability. What do you think 18 accessory liability is? Ms. Oakley, I'll pick on 19 2.0 you for a minute. The person that's in the get-away car. 21 Α Okay. That's exactly right. Okay. Anybody else 22 Q 23 want to add anything to that or think of any other 24 hypothetical? Mr. Yoder, what do you think? I just agreed with what you're saying. If you're 25

- an accomplice, you're right in with them.
- Q All right. Legally the definition is exactly what you're talking about. A person who aids, induces, or causes another person to commit an offense, still commits that offense, and they're held liable under the law. Mr. Emerson, do you think that's
- 8 A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

9 Q All right. Mrs. Cramer?

appropriate?

- 10 A Yes.
- 11 Q Anybody feel uncomfortable about that concept?

 12 Think it's not right. No. Everybody is okay with

 13 that. Mr. Ball?
- 14 A Yes.
- 15 Q Mr. Hoffman?
- 16 A Yes. Within the realm from what I can do with my religion, yes.
 - Q Okay. And we'll talk about that a little bit more here in a little bit. I noticed that on your questionnaire that you made some comments about that. We'll talk a little more in length as well.

 Okay. So I'm out driving the car, and Mrs. Clark goes in and robs that, and I drive her away. Am I

just as guilty of the felony murder?

25 (The jurors answered in the

affirmative.)

2.0

- Q Does anybody have any questions about that? No.

 If you do, now is the time to let me know. Okay.

 Thank you very much. All right. Let's move on
 then and talk about you guys a little bit. How
 many of you have served on a jury panel before?

 Actually served. Ms. Brown, what kind of case was
 it?
- A One was a bank robbery, another one was a case against Elkhart General. Those are the two that I recall.
- Q Boy, you'll a professional, aren't you? Well, we don't want you on this jury then. No, I'm kidding. That's great because this enables us to probably pick on you a whole lot as far as using you for hypotheticals. But then also can you tell everybody how hard it is?
- A It's just very, very important to listen. You know, don't daydream. You know, get in a daze because you're going to miss important information. So it's very important to pay close attention.
- Q Okay. Is it something you wanted to do before you were selected as a juror?
- A I'm fine with doing it. It wasn't any of my aspirations in life.

2.0

Okay. Let me guess. How many of you really want to be here? Absolutely nobody. I'm glad you're honest with me about that. Thank you. You know, individuals when they get in -- especially when they're in the box, out here it's even worse because you're not even being asked questions; but once you get in the box, you're thinking about a 1,000 other things that you need to be doing, and I mean need to be doing.

But what we also have to balance that with is how important the safety of our community is.

That's where you come in. Does anybody have anything going on in their life that they think is more important than paying attention here? Let us know now because if you do we got to talk about it.

We cannot have people day dreaming.

This is going to be honestly what we have called a sophisticated trial. While there's some evidence that's real obvious in this trial, there's a lot of stuff that's going to take some intelligence to put together. You can't be day dreaming here. You can't be thinking about what's happening at work. Okay. How many of you have any trouble thinking you're going to be able to give us what you need to as far as member of the community?

Ms. Cramer, what's going on?

- A I am the sole provider in my family and single mother of two, plus I'm going to school full time and working full time. There's a lot on my plate.
- Q Sure. I understand that. Believe me. I've got a little one at home right now too. Here's -- here's my question to you. These were neighbors, would you want somebody to be doing something about it?
- A Yes.

2.0

- Q Why do you think that you can't do something about it for the next few days?
- A Financially I can't afford it.
- Q Okay. All right. Now, I will tell you that we don't expect evidence to go anymore than through Wednesday. We should wrap this case up on Wednesday. It might be Thursday. I will let you know that now. Worst case scenario is we have to do half days Thursday and Friday, and it would be Friday afternoon. But none of believe it would be anymore than that. I want to let you know that now.

In addition, the judge indicated you do get a little stipend. Obviously, it's not enough to replace your income. So, Ms. Cramer, really the bottom line question: If we were to keep you on

this jury, would you be -- understanding your financial issue because we do. Believe me there are many many people that are like you. Would you be able to give us your attention and do the job of a juror, or would you be so focussed on not being able to pay the bills that you wouldn't be able to pay attention?

A It would be hard.

2.0

- Q I know it would.
- A I would try and do my best.
 - Q Okay. Well, that's all we can ask. That's all we can ask. You know, we only have certain amount of jurors, and unfortunately we got to be careful.

 But we need to know if it's something that's going to take you away from it. Okay. Thank you. I appreciate that information. Ms. Oakley, you also indicated you got a conflict?
 - A I'm a stay-at-home mom. My kids are out on summer break right now. Obviously, once I sit in here, it's important. It's an important thing to do, and I would love to do my duty. I'd rather do it when the kids are back in school. I'm sure everybody feels that way and, you know, it's just going to be extra concentration not to be thinking about keeping them on schedule.

- Q Are you comfortable with where your children are today?
- A Yes.

- 4 Q And as I --
 - A And all week. I can all week.
 - Q Okay. I told you what the schedule is, and we're pretty sure we're going to stick to that as the worst case scenario. Do you think that knowing you as you know you best that you would be able to give us 100 percent even though it would be hard?
 - A Yes.
- Q Okay. Thank you. I appreciate your honesty.

 Somebody else over here raised their hand too?
 - A I would like to be here also. The only problem I have I was car in a car accident a few weeks ago, and I hurt my tailbone and spine, and it would be very hard for me to sit for hours at a time.
 - Q Okay. Mrs. Tullis, you've indicated that you've got a lower back injury. Are you uncomfortable right now?
 - A A little, but not to the point that I have to leave or anything.
 - Q Okay. Usually we take a break about every hour and a half to two hours. In addition to that, you're welcome to stand up and stretch if you need to.

And anytime you need a break, waive the judge down. 1 He'll accommodate that with any problem. Do you 2 3 believe that that would assist you in making you comfortable enough to at least try? 4 Well, of course I do. There is one other thing. I 5 Α babysit for my daughter, and she has no other 6 7 babysitter. I've been there six years, and this would be a hardship on her also. 8 9 Q All right. Does she have any other person that 10 could possibly fill in for next couple days? No, she doesn't, but she would have to take off. 11 12 Okay. Let me ask you something. You indicated Q 13 from your car accident and you do have a back 14 injury. Are you on any medications that effect your abilities to perceive or to stay awake? 15 16 No. Α 17 All right. Very good. Thank you for that information. While we're talking, let's go ahead 18 and talk about your acquaintance with Ms. Canen. 19 20 Do -- are you sure that it's the same person that you're thinking about, or help me understand. 21 She looks very familiar. I've seen her before, but 22 Α 23 couldn't tell you when or where, but I known I've 24 seen her. 25 Okay. That actually helps because that tells me

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

you're not friends, you don't hang out together, that kind of thing. Is there anything about the occasions where you have seen her or any time where you may have come into contact with her if it was her that might effect your abilities to be fair and impartial in this case? I don't believe so. Δ Thank you very much. I appreciate that 0 8 information. Ms. Oakley also indicated that she 10 recognized Lana. Same question to you. What kind of a capacity? I believe she babysat for me. Α 13 Q Okay. And anything about that relationship with her, that acquaintance or anything about that that might effect your abilities to be fair and

> Α I never had an issue with her, but always had questions.

impartial in this case?

- That's -- you don't need to elaborate on that any Q further. I appreciate that information. And then somebody else. It was Mr. Hoffman.
- I have a very mild case of narcolepsy and also ADD.
- Okay. I appreciate that information. Why don't we go ahead and talk a little bit about the comments you made on your questionnaire about your

conscientious beliefs, your religious belief. And this goes for everybody whether it be religious, conscientious or otherwise. Does it make -- I'm going to say two different -- or I'm going to say a phrase, and I want you to tell me whether it makes sense to you or not. There's God law, and then there's man's law. We have nothing to do no power with God's law; however, man's law we have the duty to enforce. Does that make sense to you?

A For you to enforce, yes.

- Q Okay. You just characterized that in a way that I think I understand where you're coming from. It is -- this it something that you personally don't believe that you are capable of doing.
- A I don't believe that I'm allowed to do that.
- Q Okay. Could you elaborate just a little bit for the record, Mr. Hoffman?
- A Well, the Bible says that I'm not to be in a place of judgment. I wouldn't be able to render any type of decision I believe.
- Q Okay. I appreciate that information. How many of you see this as judging a person? Raise your hands if you do or even slightly as judging a person.

 Mr. Hoffman you do, Ms. Oakley you do. Sometimes

 I'll make this statement. You are judging facts

not a person. How many of you know very very good people, very good people, who do stupid and even criminal things? Raise your hands if you do. Even you yourself. Okay. What you will be asked -- actually, Ms. Brown, I'm going to pick on you. Since you were a juror before, what is a juror's responsibility during a trial?

A To listen to the facts.

2.0

- Q Okay. Does it matter whether you like the person on trial?
- A You're not supposed to allow that to enter into your decision.
- Q Okay. The way you phrased that, though, makes me think twice. Tell me why you phrased it that way.
- A I think it's hard -- I think it's difficult, you know, to not be compassionate.
- Q Okay. Anybody who on this panel right now afraid you might be compassionate in a case, especially a murder case? And I'm not asking to find out whether you're a cold hearted people. That's not what this is about, folks. You know, you heard me talk about the victim in this case. You heard me talk about the individuals that are likely to witnesses in this case including the defendants just the way that they are. We've got to talk

- about sympathies compassions --
- 2 A I have two things that I need to bring up. Will the death penalty be on the table?
 - Q No, it is.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

16

17

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- A Okay. I'm fine with that then. And I used to work with a gentlemen named Larry Woods that I think lived at the Waterfall Highrise. Is he present so I can look and see if I know him?
- Q He is not present. Was he associated with Seifert Drugs?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q Okay. How well do you know him?
- A Not well at all. You know, I just know his name,
 and I knew where he lived. I gave him a ride home.
 - Q Okay. Anything about your acquaintance with him that might effect your ability to be fair and impartial if he is a witness?
- 18 A No, I don't believe so.
 - Q All right. Thank you. Mr. Brown brought up a very important point about compassion, and it applies to both sides. Not only because of the state, you know, the victim is what she was, and that really really hits home with some people. You got to put that out of your minds, folks. You have to because who the victim is makes absolutely no difference to

the laws of the State of Indiana. None. And you have to be honest with yourselves on that.

In addition, the defendants or any of witnesses, compassion cannot come into this courtroom. Common sense has got to come in.

That's the one thing you bring in, but your sympathies and your compassions have to stay outside the door. You can grab them on the way out because you're going to need them; but when you come through that door, they have to stay out.

Does anyone feel like you have some trouble with that concept? You know you best. There's no way Mr. Williams or any of us can get to know you that fast and that thoroughly. So please let us know now if anybody is worried about your compassions kicking in. Okay. Thank you very much.

All right. Then we'll be go back to does anyone have any religious conscientious scruples, any issues whatsoever about doing this job of a juror; namely, looking at facts, and figuring out do they fall into behavior that is illegal under the laws of the State of Indiana? Let me know now. Mr. Tullis?

A No.

2.0

```
1
        Q
            No problems?
 2
        Α
            No.
           Mrs. Clark?
 3
        Q
 4
        Α
            No.
           Mr. Ball.
 5
 6
        Α
            No.
 7
            Ms. Cramer?
        Q
 8
        Α
            No.
 9
            Mr. Emerson?
10
        Α
            No.
            Mr. Yoder?
11
        Q
12
        Α
            No.
            Mr. Enos?
13
        Q
14
        Α
           No.
15
        Q
            Mr. Oakley?
16
        Α
            No.
            Mr. Miller?
17
        Q
18
            No.
        A
19
        Q
            Mr. Peachey?
20
        Α
            No.
            Mr. Hauffman, you've already indicated your
21
        Q
22
            opinion. Thank you. Very much for your honesty.
23
            Mrs. Brown?
24
        Α
            No.
25
            Okay. Thank you. Move on a little bit to the next
        Q
```

topic. How many of you have heard of the concept 1 beyond a reasonable doubt? Raise your hands if you 2 3 have. Pretty much everybody. All right. Mr. Miller, let's pick on you a little bit. What is 4 beyond a reasonable doubt? 5 Beyond a reasonable doubt would be a fraction of a 6 7 doubt that's in your mind. Okay. Does it mean all doubt? 0 8 9 Α No, just a fraction. 10 0 Okay. Does anybody disagree with that? Say no 11 Mr. Emerson? 12 I don't disagree with that. Α 13 Q Don't disagree with that all. Does anybody feel 14 uncomfortable about that because here, folks, we're talking about a criminal case? We're talking about 15 16 a criminal case here. Don't you think it ought to 17 be beyond all doubt. Okay. You're shaking your head, Mrs. Peachey? 18 I think that the evidence should be beyond all 19 Α 20 doubt 100 percent sure. Okay. All right. 21 Q 22 That there's no evidence that they couldn't be 23 guilty. 24 Okay. You just said two different things. You may 25 not know it, but you did. The defense has to put

on no evidence whatsoever. They can sit over there all day and play crossword puzzles. They don't have to cross-exam any witness. They don't have to do anything, and you may not hold that against them in any way, shape, or form. It is entirely upon the State of Indiana to prove this case.

Now, everybody understand that? Okay.

Anybody think that's fair? unfair? Anybody have any problems with it? Let me ask it that way. No. All right. Now, here's the next part and this is the kicker. Individuals who perceive things, who saw things, are going to come in, sit in this witness chair, and tell you what they perceived.

None of you were there. Can any of you honestly say that you can find beyond all doubt if your weren't there seeing it yourself? Anybody think they can? Okay. Then every criminal has to go free. See what I'm saying.

You have to be able to open your minds and rely upon other persons perceptions because that's the best it can possibly get. The best it can get. And then on top of that, you have to deal with you have what you have. Unfortunately, it's not a situation where persons with perfect hearing, perfect eyesight, perfect memory, and perfect

morals are going to be coming in here as witnesses to you. You don't find swans in a sewer, folks.

So you're going to have to rely on people that you may not even want in your house to be the witnesses in this case.

Now, how many of you think you're not going to be able to give them the same credibility that you would, maybe not yourself, but at least some other person that you might know? Anybody think you're going to have problems that? Do you see where I'm coming from? So does that mean that everybody walks? See, you got to open your mind a little bit, and as a juror you have the power to believe what you wish, disbelieve what you wish, and make inferences from what you do hear because a lot of times the truth is often found in the answering of falsity or it's found somewhere between, or you can fill in the picture.

That's why I was telling you earlier. This is a sophisticated case. You are not going to have a situation where you have any eyewitnesses. It's this person saw a little bit. This person saw a little bit. It's a puzzle. It's a puzzle, and you got to put this puzzle together. You're never going to have all the pieces, never, because there

was no videotape, with audio, tracking everything that happened here. You can't do it. It's just life. How many of you thought about that before? I mean, Mrs. Brown, you probably have because you've been in these shoes before. But when you woke up this morning knowing you were coming here to go to a jury trial, how many of you thought about the fact this is going to be tough? Nobody.

So how are you feeling about that now?

Ms. Peachey, let's just continue with you. Do you see why this is going to be a problem? Let me ask you this. Knowing you as you know you best, do you think you can do this job since you got to open your mind a little bit more than what you had previously thought?

- A Yes.
- Q You think you can?
- 18 A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- 19 Q You think you're going to have any problems with 20 it?
- 21 A No.
- 22 Q Okay. Fantastic. Mr. Miller, what about you?
- 23 A I'm fine with it.
- Q You're fine with it. Ms. Oakley, hesitantly nodding your head.

- A Hesitantly nodding my head.
- Q It's tough, and you're not going to know for sure
 until you're sitting here for the trial. Mr. Enos?
- 4 A Yes.

- 5 Q Mr. Yoder?
 - A No problem?
- 7 Q Mr. Emerson?
- 8 A Fine with that.
- 9 Q Ms. Cramer?
- 10 A It would be hard?
- 11 Q Mr. Ball.
- 12 A I won't have any problem.
- 13 Q Mrs. Clark?
- 14 A I'll be okay.
- 15 Q Ms. Tullis. You're fine with that. Okay. Great.
- 16 Now, let's go on to another thing. How many of you
- 17 watch CSI? I pull up both hands because I love
- 18 them. I love these shows. They just -- they're so
- 19 entertaining to me. Only a few of you. That
- 20 really surprises me cause it's kind of the, you
- 21 know, the Law and Order the CSI stuff anymore is
- really it. How many of you think CSI has a shred
- of credibility to it in really life? Okay. C'mon
- 24 somebody. Mrs. Brown, you do?
- 25 A They have a shred of evidence.

- Q Okay. Let me phrase it a different way. You're probably right. A shred of credibility. How many of you think that what you see on CSI or any of these forensic file type shows is how it is in real life?
- A No.

- Q No. Okay. Good. That makes me feel much better.
 You can't get a fingerprint off of a puddle, folks.
 You just can't do it. You're going to hear
 testimony in this case that's going to educate you.
 How many of you know anything, and when I ask this
 I know you're probably thinking formal education.
 I'm not. If any of you have any ideas in your head
 about what you can get fingerprints off of or DNA
 or anything, any kind of scientific forensic
 evidence whether you've read it in a newspaper, in
 a journal, or you actually have training in this
 topic, let me know now. Anybody. You've read
 stuff in the newspaper. Nobody?
- A Are you saying do we understand what you can get evidence from?
- Q What I'm trying to find out --
- 23 A You can get DNA from a hair, you know.
 - Q Right. In some circumstances, sure. What I'm trying to find out is what kind of ideas do you

2.0

guys have, or what kinds of expectations do you have about evidence, and are they reasonable?

Because we've had so many jurors come in here and say, well, you didn't fingerprint the dope bag, so how can we say that they touched it. Well, because you don't get fingerprints unless you've got certain surfaces, certain conditions.

Jurors want to impose what they've learned either from talking to their neighbor on the street, reading in the newspaper, what they see on T.V. And we got to know if that's what you're, you know, what your mind is automatically going to do, or are you going to clear your mind of that, listen to the evidence as it comes in, and base your decision exclusively upon what you are learning through this trial? Okay. Does that make sense to everybody?

How many of you are going to clear your minds and forget what you think you may know already, and be educated here? Let me know if your are. Raise your hand. Everybody is raising your hand. Mr. Hoffman, we've already talked so we're fine. Okay. Thank you very much. I just want to make sure you all understand while we wish this was CSI cause it would be great to get a DNA result in about an

hour, you know, realistically it's a year and a half. These are things you just, you know, you're going to learn, but you may not know now, and I don't want it to cloud your ability to serve.

2.0

Next thing I want you to tell me about is how much you know -- actually, let's just skip that.

Let's move on to you. Some of these questions are going to be a little bit tougher. We've talked a little bit now, but some of these things are going to ask you to pry into some of the darkens of your personality, and please be honest with us not matter what. Ms. Tullis, I'm just going to start with you because you're No. 1 in the one chair.

Do you have any strong feelings, and I phrase it that way because it's not something that rises to the level of a bias or a prejudice or anything like that, do you have any strong feelings about law enforcement, individuals with physical or mental conditions, lawyers in general, people from different socioeconomic levels, different lifestyles than you, anything that you think might effect your ability to be fair or impartial in this case? And if you want to ask me about something, you're welcome to. This is a good time for us to talk.

- A No, I don't believe so.
- Q You can't think of anything. What areas of the newspaper do you read first if you read the newspaper?
 - A I don't read it often but first page one. I read the front section and the religion section and that's about.
 - Q And that's about it. Okay. Do you have any questions of me so far?
 - A No.

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

23

24

- 11 Q What do you think about serving as juror other than
 12 what we've already talked about?
 - A I think it's fine.
 - Q All right. Thank you. Mrs. Clark, what about you any strong feelings about anything?
 - A Only extremely strong feeling I have is people who live in our country illegally.
- Q Okay. Not going to come up here. I can tell you that right now. Not going to come up here.
- 20 Anything that you have observed so far, anything
 21 that you're uncomfortable about the possibility of
 22 serving as a juror in this case?
 - A The only thing I can say is when I came in and we were introducing people the name registered nothing with me; however, when you started talking about

- the case I do remember reading it in the paper when it happened. But, you know, I don't remember anything about since then.
- All right. Very good. The fact that you just indicated you don't remember anything about it answers the next group of questions so I'm just going to skip over that. When you read it in the paper, though, is there anything about the fact that you read it you probably had some kind of an emotional reaction at that time. Is it something that you're able to set aside now and get down to business?
- A Yes.

2.0

- Q Any questions of me?
- A As a trial is going on, are we allowed to take notes?
 - You will be allowed to take notes. The judge will instruct you that while you're allowed to take notes, and you will be furnished with paper and pens to do so, do not allow the process of taking notes to distract. Sometimes when people are writing, they're not listening to what's going on so be aware of what your capabilities are in that area. But you are certainly welcome to take notes.

There are approximately 25 witnesses that we

would expect. Many of them are very short. But 1 then in the end, we do a closing summary which 2 kinds of brings everything together because it will 3 seem very disjointed during the trial, but then in 4 the end we'll bring it all together. Any other 5 questions? No. Mr. Ball, what about you any 6 7 strong feelings about anything? Α I had concerns and fears because my mother lived on 8 the Riverside Highrise at that time. 9 10 Q Okay. So do you remember reading about this in the 11 paper? 12 Α Yeah. 13 Q All right. Anything about the way that you just --14 what you just talked about as well as your emotional reaction at the time that you think might 15 16 effect your abilities to be fair today? 17 Α No, I don't think so. You don't think so. Okay. All right. Have I 18 0 failed to ask you any specific question or any 19 2.0 group of questions that might have brought out information that you think would be important for 21 us to know? 22 23 Α No. 24 0 Would you be a good juror for this case? 25 Α I'll try.

- Q I'll try. What do you think your strongest characteristic is that would be helpful in this case?
- A Good judgment probably.

2.0

- Q Okay. Let me ask you this. What would your wife say?
- A She's babysitting in South Bend.
- Q All right. Does she think that you have common sense, or does she bug you about that?
- A Most of the time.
- Q Most of the time. Honest answer. I appreciate that. All right. Common sense is going to be very important here. There's no two ways about it simply because you're gonna have to put two and two together. Do you think that's something that you're capable of doing or interested in doing in this case?
- A Sure.
 - Q Ms. Cramer, we've already talked, but I want to ask you any further. Is there anything that you can think of as far as strong feelings about anything that we've not asked you about been --
- A I have strong feelings, but I don't think it will effect the case.
- Q Okay. Let me ask you this because I don't want to

pry obviously, but unfortunately you don't know all 1 the details of the case yet, and is it something 2 3 that if it comes up it's going kick you? I mean, is it going to be like here we go? Is it that 4 strong of a feeling? 5 Α No. It has to do with dead beat dads and different 6 7 lifestyles. Then, yeah. That doesn't have anything to do with 0 8 9 this. Thank you. It's hard to be generic, and you 10 tell me, and then I tell you it's safe. You know how it is. Can you think of anything that I 11 12 haven't ask you yet that we should have asked you 13 in order to get better information? 14 Α I can't think of anything. Do you have any questions of me so far? 15 0 16 Α No. 17 Anything about this process thus far that you're uncomfortable, with anything like that? 18 It's just knew to me, and I'll have to learn as I 19 Α 2.0 go along. That's okay. We like it that way. The last thing 21 Q we want is somebody's who's comfortable in that 22 23 seat quite frankly. Yes, ma'am. 24 Α I do know several people that have lived there. 25 0 At Waterfall?

A Yes.

- Q Do you think that fact you know several people that
 have lived at Waterfall will effect your abilities
 to be fair here?
 - A I don't think so. I don't think so. I just wanted you to know that.
 - Q Have you visited the Waterfall before?
 - A I've been there once.
 - Q Been there once. Okay. Based upon your acquaintances with individuals who have lived there, I guess what I need to know with is will you set aside anything that they may have told you about living there because we can't have you bringing in facts that are not evidence. Does that make sense?
 - A Right. I haven't heard any facts about anybody living there.
 - Q What about anything going on there, anything about what the place is like?
 - A No. Other than the fact that I knew some people who lived there, but they weren't really close acquaintances with me.
 - Q I just have to make sure that you're not going to be, you know, hey, I know what looks like, and it's like this, and they're two

apartments down from the elevator. You know what I 1 2 mean? 3 Α Right. Anything that you can think of that might be 4 Q problem there? 5 I don't think so. 6 Α 7 All right. Very good. Mr. Emerson, can you think Q of any issues, you know, same questions I've been 8 asking everybody else that might effect your 9 10 ability to be fair and impartial in this case? I don't think so. 11 12 You don't think so. What do you think about this Q 13 concept that you're really in a vacuum, you know. 14 You've got to rely upon what other people have seen, perceived, and rely upon their perceptive 15 abilities in order to make a decision here? 16 17 Α I think you just got to make it on the facts of what your gut feeling. 18 And do the best you can. Okay. Fair enough. Mr. 19 Q 2.0 Yoder, we haven't talked at all. What do you think about this process so far? 21 It's very interesting. I'm willing to, you know, 22 Α 23 do my part. 24 0 Do you have any questions thus far? 25 Α No. You were asking if I had any problem with --

with -- with the case or the situation.

Q Yes.

2.0

A I just want to say that I am really really proprosecution on almost everything, and I'm not sure if I can keep an open mind primarily because when I read about this case when it first came out --

THE COURT: Hold on for just a minute. Anybody who has read anything about this case, do not repeat in open court what you read. Do not repeat what you read. Go ahead, Ms. Becker.

- Q Fair enough. Thank you. Go ahead.
- A What I was going to say was that I got a flashback to the murder of AJ Williams, and I was close with him, and it effected me really badly. And I don't, I'm just so proprosecution on things I don't know that if I could claim to be fair and open about this.
- Q Okay. I appreciate you bringing that out. Let's talk about that a little bit. When you say you're proprosecution, many people are. In fact, many people are just down right boom, boom, boom. Yet when they sit in this chair, it becomes really clear that they're serious about this business, and they're going to make us do our job. And you know

- why? Because they want to know that the people representing them are doing everything that they can. Does that make sense to you?
- A Yes, I understand.
- Q Have you or has there been times when you have been disappointed in either a police investigation or a prosecution or something that you've seen so far?
- A No.

2.0

- Q No. Okay. Do you believe that you can try -actually, let's not even ask that because this is
 really the bottom line. Knowing you as you know
 you best, do you feel like it would be so difficult
 for you to set aside your memories of AJ as well as
 your proprosecution personality and exclusively
 base this case and your decision on what you learn
 in this courtroom?
- A I am very willing to try to do that, but I just wanted to let you know.
- Q And I appreciate that very much because, you know, otherwise if I would have skipped over you because, you know, whatever, we would have missed that, and we can't have that. But what I've got to know, and trying is good, but really what we've got to find out, and I'll come back to you on this. I'll let you think about it a few minutes more. Trying

- isn't good enough at this stage. I've got to know that you aren't going to give us the benefit of the doubt because you got to give them the benefit of the doubt.
- A Sure, I understand.
- Q Okay. I'll come back in a little bit. Ms. Brown, anything that I failed to ask you that we should have asked you so we get to know you better as far as qualities for this case?
- 10 A No.

11 Q Do you think you'd be a good juror?

that okay or not?

- 12 A Yes.
- 13 Q Okay.
 - A I would like to say something. I wear hearings aids, and I've been able to hear you very clearly.

 I was able to hear your Honor very clearly. This lady I couldn't hear anything that she said. So if I were to raise my hand if I missed something, is
 - Q Absolutely. We would hope you would do that.

 Well, good. Then maybe she got away with the robbery. And, you know, I try and make fun during this time because we got to get to know each other and feel comfortable with each other. I don't want to depreciate the seriousness of this case or what

we're doing here so please don't be offended by this. But sometimes when you get to talk, it enables us to make better judgment at this point, so I hope I'm not offending anyone, and we've already talked, Mr. Hoffman, so I'm going to move on to Ms. Peachey.

Anything about what we've talked about so far, the little thumb nail I gave you earlier about this case, anything you think is going to bite up and say, hey, I can't quite be fair because of this experience or because of this principle that I stand for?

- A No.
- 14 Q You're okay with that?
- 15 A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

21

22

23

- 16 Q Anything that I failed to ask you?
- 17 A No.
- 18 Q You want to be a juror?
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 Q Why?
 - A You know, the only thing that I think about how work is going to be. They're going to be short, but they will pay me for being here. I'll get my wage. So, you know.
- 25 Q That's huge?

- A That's huge. They're real into doing their civic duty so I'm very fortunate of that, and I think it's a little scary. It's so awesome to think someone's fate could be in my decision or collective decision of a group of people. That's pretty awesome.
- Q It is awesome.

- A And a little scary, but I would -- one of my strong points is I do listen to both sides, and I feel that I can be, you know, listen to both sides and understand both sides.
- Q Okay. That's great. Any problem with the fact that like I indicated earlier, and I think you and I were talking that it's entirely the state's burden to prove this case?
- A I understand that.
 - Q Okay. Very good. There's going to be holes.

 There are no two ways about simply because we can't -- we can't go out and hand pick. You get what you get, and unfortunately it's not always as easy as it looks. The fact that you're going to be in a vacuum, you know. You're only going to get to hear what's there. You think you're still going to be able to make a decision?
- 25 A Yes.

- Q Okay. Very good. Mr. Miller, anything about your life experiences, your background, your personal feelings about anything that you think might nibble at you and effect your ability to be fair and impartial?
- A No, I don't think so.

- Q What do you think your strongest characteristic is that might be beneficial or detrimental to this jury?
- A Probably to listen to both sides. It's a very important case obviously, and listen to the details.
- Q Okay. Mr. Miller, you're the third person that's brought up sentencing issues. Sentencing is not something that you are going to be thinking about at all during this trial, during this part of the trial. Why do you think that is?
- A Because that would be the Court's decision to sentence.
- Q Exactly.
 - A Ours is guilty or not guilty.
- Q All right. Let me ask you this. Does a sentence
 or any punishment or any consequence whatsoever
 happening now or in a few days effect what happened
 back in November of 2002? Does it change facts

that may have occurred?

A No.

2.0

- Q Do you think that if someone was worried about imposing a consequence that it would effect their perception of how those facts occurred because they were worried?
- A I don't think so.
 - Is anybody worried about that that worrying what your consequences you think might color your ability to keep an open mind and listen to the facts that occurred? Anybody worried about that?

 Do you see where I'm coming from? Okay. Does anybody have any concerns about that? We've had a lot of jurors who said, well, I was so worried about what might happen, or I saw the defendant's mom sitting in the courtroom and I couldn't, you know, come back and say that with her there. You see what I'm saying.

It doesn't change the facts that happened in November of '02, but are you strong enough individuals that you can set that aside? Does anybody think you're going to have problems with that? Let me know now if you do. Okay. All right. Have I failed to ask you any questions that I should have asked in order to get some more

information? 1 2 Α No. Okay. Very good. Ms. Oakley, anything about this 3 Q case so far, any of the things you've observed, 4 what's been going on, that might effect your 5 abilities to be fair and impartial? 6 7 No, in don't think so. Α And we haven't talked at all yet other than just a 0 8 couple Uh-huh or uh-huh. Mr. Enos, what do you 9 10 think about this whole process so far? It's a lot more involved than I expected. 11 12 Q Is it? 13 Α Oh, yeah. And I don't know if this is going to sound weird or 14 not, but when you got here and we told you it was a 15 16 murder case, what was your knee jerk reaction? 17 Α Surprised you. I never been here before. I didn't know what to expect, but I didn't expect a murder 18 19 case. 20 Yeah. How do you feel about it now now that we've Q gone through almost an hour of chatting --21 It's interesting. 22 Α 23 It's interesting. Do you have any hesitations 24 whatsoever about your ability to be fair and 25 impartial in this case?

- 1 A No.
- Q Any hesitations about your ability to serve and actually, you know, with all the limitations make a
- 4 decision on this case?
- 5 A No.
- 6 Q Any questions of me?
- 7 A No.
- 8 Q What have I failed to ask you that I should have 9 asked you?
- 10 A Nothing that I can think of.
- 11 Q Not that good. You can't think of anything.
- 12 A Quiet little life. Do my job, I go home, read a
- book.
- Q What kind of books do you like to read?
- 15 A I read all kinds of books. History mostly.
- 16 Q History mostly.
- 17 A History novels.
- 18 Q What kind of mystery novels do you like?
- 19 A History.
- 20 Q History novels. I'm sorry. All right. What did
- 21 you think about my conversations, I can't even
- remember who it was with, I don't remember, about
- 23 being in a vacuum the fact that you're not going to
- here everything you want to hear.
- 25 A That's the way I am. Keep to myself. I don't

watch T.V. You talk about CSI. I've never seen

it. I don't watch network TV. It bores me to

death.

2.0

- Q Very good. That's okay. Believe me. I don't have a problem with that. We have one TV in our house.

 It's downstairs in the basement and you know --
- A I watch the history channel and National Geographic, speed channel 2.
- Q The truth comes out. All right. Last chance folks. Does anybody have any questions of me, anything that is kind of nibbling at you we need to talk again? Can you think of anything that I should have asked you? No.
- A Does it matter if you said it involved some mentally challenged people psychiatrically challenged or whatever. I was a psychiatric nurse for five years at Oaklawn, but I don't know -- I don't know if they were even involved. But does that, I mean, is that something that you want to know?
- Q It is exactly. That's exactly the things that we want to know. My question to you, and it's, I mean, it's very flat out. That is not defense in this case. It's not a situation where there's going to be evidence, medical evidence or

psychiatric evidence in any way, shape, or form.

It's what you're going pick up on your common sense.

Now, now that you've told me you're a skilled person, I know your common sense is sharper in that area because you've been trained to do this kind of thing. What we have to say is that can you set aside your special training and not share that with the remainder of the jury because, see, I don't know what your training is. None of us do. And we can't run a risk that you would back in the jury room say, hey, I know about this, and I know about this. You absolutely cannot do that. Do you understand that?

A Yes.

- Q Okay. The fact that you do have some special training in that while it may effect, you know, how you're perceiving things, do you think it would effect your abilities to be fair?
- A No.
- Q Okay. Very good. Thank you. I appreciate you're sharing that. See, that's one of those things where I don't ask the right question. Okay. Does anybody else have anything that you're thinking about do we want to know? No. Okay. Mr. Yoder,

I'm going to come back to you. If you were -- now
I know you've already indicated you're pretty
proprosecution. If you were sitting over at
defense counsel table, would you want a juror of
your mindset in this case?

A Probably not.

2.0

Q Okay. That's what I needed to know. Thank you. I appreciate that very much. Anybody else have any questions? Thank you so much for your time.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to give you recess at the time. During this recess, I need to remind you. You are all prospective jurors in this case. You are prohibited from discussing this case with anyone prior to the commencement of the evidentiary portion of the trial. To do so may result in a mistrial.

After the presentation of evidence has begun, jurors may discuss the evidence presented amongst themselves in the jury room during recesses. All regular jurors and alternates must be present during such discussion. You must reserve judgement concerning the outcome of the case until jury deliberations begin.

 $\hbox{You may not discuss the facts of this case with } \\ \\ \hbox{me or with the lawyers or with any of the witnesses}.$

You may not investigate the case yourselves or attempt to obtain information outside the courtroom. It

```
is highly improper for you to do so. You are also
 1
      prohibited from reading any newspaper accounts of this
 2
      case and from listening to or watching any radio or
 3
      television reports relating to this trial.
 4
                You are to consider and decide this case only
 5
      upon the evidence received during the course of the trial
 6
 7
      here in the courtroom.
                I'm going ask that you remain in the jury room
 8
      until we call for your return into the courtroom. You'll
 9
10
      be in care of the bailiff.
                     (A short recess was taken.)
11
12
                THE COURT: The record should reflect that the
13
      defendants plural are present, their counsel are present,
14
      counsel for the state is present, Mr. Joel Williams.
      Juror 1730 RaShonda King has been excused by agreement.
15
      She's indicated to the bailiff she is no longer a
16
      resident of this county. For that reason, everyone has
17
      agreed she will be excused because she will not qualify
18
19
      as a juror.
2.0
                     (The prospective jury entered the
                     courtroom, and the following
21
                     proceedings were had.)
22
23
                THE COURT: Be seated, please. Mr. Zook.
24
                MR. ZOOK: Thank you, Judge.
      1111
25
```

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. ZOOK:

2.0

Q Good morning. After I go, Chris over here goes, and then we repeat the process over and over and over and over and it will be a nice long day, and you'll get a lot of sleep tonight.

I just need to go some things concerning the trial process to see if you can follow it, and then I need to find out a bit about you because this is the only opportunity I'll have to do that. But first of all, we have an estimate here of perhaps through Thursday, maybe Wednesday, at the most Friday, and no one really things it's going to go that far. Does anyone have a real problem with the way -- with the timetable? If you do, raise your hand. You know, you've already spoken your problems here. Okay.

Now, that could change because it isn't just up to us, and it isn't just up to the evidence here, it's up to you. You are the people that meet and make a decision and talk things over before making the decision. So you're the ones that are going to determine in part how long the trial takes, and it could be that you're released into the jury room at, say, ten o'clock at night under

the worst circumstances, and you're asked to make a decision.

2.0

Are there any of you who feel that you might not be able to think well enough or not be able to give your full attention to the case even though it's late, you've struggled with the case for hours, and it's Friday, say, or Thursday, and you want to go home? Are there any of you who feel that the case isn't important enough, this murder case, that you really couldn't work on it, and you've give your vote up in order to prevent a disagreement? That's what I'm really asking. If so, raise your hand. I have had it happen before. Just a little bit. Okay.

I've seen it happen where people did that.

They said, well, it was late. Okay. How about you say, Sarah, you said that that would be a problem for you a little bit?

- A It would just be hard because I have a one and a three year old at home, and being a single mother I would want to be there for them.
- Q Okay. It is sounds like you're getting a little emotional about that. Is it just the fear of being in the courtroom?
- A No. It's just that I'm their only parent at home,

1 and I want to be there at ten o'clock to put them 2 in bed. Sorry. 3 Okay. Juries might often run late on the night of the decision. Would that be a real problem for you 4 to do? 5 (The juror indicated.) 6 7 Do you think you could keep your mind on what's Q going on in the in the courtroom instead of 8 thinking about your children? 9 10 Α No. Oh, no. Okay. Mr. Yoder, did you ever think that 11 Q 12 you might be arrested for crime you didn't commit? 13 Α Yeah. 14 Q You did? Oh, yeah, sure. 15 Α 16 Well, did it ever happen to you? 17 Α No. 18 Q Okay. THE COURT: You need to remember all of you 19 20 we're trying record what is stated so you need to answer 21 audibly. 22 Α Okay. 23 Okay. Now, you understand when someone is arrested 24 that doesn't mean the person's guilty. Is that 25 right?

A Yes, I understand that.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- Q Okay. I guess I don't understand then why you're prosecution oriented?
 - A I just felt like I had to say that because that's the way I feel. In this case here, I think I could be fair, listen the facts, and make a determination like anyone else, but that's something I felt needed to be said.
 - Q Okay. When, say, Michael Jackson was an trial, did you get an opinion right away about how that should go?
 - A I would say not right away, and I -- still I
 watched a little bit of that trial, and although I
 feel like most people that he probably was guilty,
 they didn't really prove it.
- 16 Q Okay.
- 17 A So he's got his own problems.
- Q I was in interested to see Rush Limbaugh say he
 even got a fair trial. All right. Tell me, are
 you a member of any organizations?
- 21 A No, sir.
- 22 Q Okay. Any churches things like that?
- 23 A No.
- 24 Q What kind of things do you like to read?
- 25 A Well, like the gentleman behind me, I'm into

- history books quite a bit. And it varies mainly 1 2 history. 3
 - Q Okay. Any particular history you're interested in?
- Word War II. 4 А
- 5 Q Okay. Thanks. Mr. Emerson, I'd like to go through the same questions with you. Are you a member of 6 7 any organizations?
- Α We belong to Winding Waters Brethren Church, 8 Bowling Association, and that's about it. 9
- 10 Q Okay. What do you like to do?
- Play golf. 11 Α
- 12 Q All right. And, Ms. Cramer, what do you like to 13 do?
- 14 Α I like to play volleyball.
- Okay. Do you do that in a team? 15 0
- 16 Α I was about four years ago, but since I've had my 17 kids I've not.
- Are you members of organizations? 18
- I'm a member of Living Faith Fellowship in Elkhart. 19 Α
- 20 Q Okay. Thank you. And Mr. Ball?
- Α Yes. 21
- Member of any organizations? 22 Q
- 23 I'm a retired marine 24 years. Α
- 24 0 Do you go to reunions things like that?
- 25 Α No, I'm too busy at home.

Q Okay. What do you like to do?

1

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- 2 A Just work around the home, maintain the house, and babysit the granddaughters.
 - Q Okay. And, Ms. Clark, same questions?
 - A I am a member of the Church of the Brethren in another part of Indiana where I group up. As far as hobbies, in the summer I love the mow the grass and work in the lawn, and we were motorcyclist. We have Goldwing motorcycle, and so we do that in weekends, and I read a lot.
 - Q Okay. What do you like to read?
 - A I read a lot of biographies even some like Danielle Steel books which everybody refers to as sophisticated trash. I read those. You know, sometimes you just have to read no-brainer books just to make you not think. I like to read self-help books.
- 18 Q Okay. Anything we can help you with?
- 19 A Probably a lot.
 - Q Okay. Ms. Tullis, how about you?
- A I like to go horseback riding; however, I haven't
 for a while. I like reading. I like walking. I
 like gardening. I don't belong to any
- 24 organizations at this time.
- 25 Q You have a horse?

- A I've had a couple, yes.
 - Q Okay. Is that how the injury happened.
- A No. It was a car accident.
 - Q Okay. Okay. Well, I can see why you wouldn't want to horseback ride.
 - A Yeah.
- Q Marilyn Brown?
- 8 A Yes.

2.0

- 9 Q How about you. Tell us about you?
 - A I belong to the Solid Rock Church of God, very active in that. I love to do trivia. I like to read murder mysteries. I like to guess who's the guilty one. I don't come up out heads up. I usually -- they'll throw in a fact too late in the book it just ruins the whole scenario. But I do crossword puzzles thinks like that.
 - Q Okay. Yes, it does. I never understood people who would do that, or -- or -- or who would cheat at solitaire. Same thing. And, Mr. Hoffman, I'm going to kind of skip over you here not that I'm not interested, but basically you've removed yourself from the panel so I'm not going to worry about it. Interested in not taking up so much time. Ms. Peachey, how about yourself any organizations?

- A I belong to Beulah Missionary Church. I like gardening, and I like boating. Read -- my husband and I have a little cottage that we're remodeling so we spend a lot of time doing that, spending time with our three boys. I love to read, love to cook, look to bake, invent new recipes.
 - Q Would your husband tell me that you're a leader or a follower?
- A He would tell you I'm a leader, and I would tell you I'm a follower.
- Q All right. Mr. Miller?
- 12 A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- 13 Q Tell us tell us about yourself?
- 14 A I belong to Nappannee Missionary Church. I enjoy
 15 photography, working outside in the yard, anything
 16 to do with outside. I have a real love of cars.
- 17 Q Okay. A real love. Tell us about that.
- A Appreciation for show cars, antique cars. I love to watch racing. Just anything to do with cars.
 - Q What were you doing yesterday?
- 21 A I was in front of my television watching the Nascar 22 race.
- Q And, Ms. Oakley, tell us about yourself.
- A I belong to Saint Mary's Church in Bristol. I do a lot of volunteer work at the school. I'm very

- involved in the school. I like to do just about any sport.
 - Q Water skiing?
- 4 A Water skiing, snow skiing.
 - Q Bike riding.
 - A Yes.

- Q Okay. What do you like to read?
- A I do books for the kids, self-help books that will help me with the kids.
 - Q I -- I was not able to hear when you were talking about my client. Assume that she is the person who babysat for you, do you believe in that case that you would be biased either for or against the case?
 - A Well, I think that I would listen to the facts, and as I sit here I've played a lot of things out in my mind, but I think I would sit and listen to the facts and use that to make a determination.
 - Q Okay. We hope that everyone does. What I'm wondering about is where you're starting from?
 - A Well, I'm starting from that I believe Lana babysat for me 11 years ago and with my children, and now she's being tried for murder. That's a lot to weigh out.
- Q Do you feel that you have any initial biassed is what I'm asking?

A I can't say that I don't.

- Q You can't say you don't; can't say you do?
- A I would will hope that I would sit here and listen
 to the case and weigh the evidence. I hope that
 that's what I would do.
 - Q Okay. And, Mr. Enos, tell us about yourself.
 - A Stay at home, take care of my yard and garden, experimenting with growing flowers, stay outside while I can. I live on the St. Joseph River so process of working on my house. That's it. Keep to myself and stay at home.
 - Q Do you get any magazines?
- A Play Station. I've discovered video games.
- Q Play Station magazines. I know you didn't want to tell us that. Okay. So who lives with you?
 - A Nobody. My wife lives out of state.
 - Q Okay. Thank you all. Mr. Enos, I want to ask you if you have thought about some of these things before. There was one thing that Ms. Becker didn't bring up concerning the way a trial is conducted. She talked about beyond a reasonable doubt being the standard of proof. Do you think anyone so far has determined that these people were guilty?
 - A I've not heard evidence yet.
- Q Okay. That's going to be your job. No one has

done that yet, and that's being put to you. Now, 1 how do you think you determine if a witness is 2 3 telling the truth? Got to watch them, how they act, how they react, 4 Α pay attention. 5 Do you think that different people would have 6 7 different actions in the courtroom when they testify? 8 I'm sure they will. Everybody's different. 9 Α 10 0 How would a person who's more accustomed to being in the courtroom testify as compared to the person 11 12 who has never done it before? 13 Α I would think they'd be more relaxed because they 14know what's going to happen. Okay. What do you see as the difference between 15 0 16 police testimony and testimony of other people? 17 Α Police officers are professionals. They're trained 18 better. Do you expect a policeman would to testify better? 19 Q 20 Α I would hope so. It's their job. How do you feel about policeman necessarily telling 21 0 the truth as opposed to lay people? 22 23 They like everybody else. They're human. Α 24 would hope they tell the truth. Thank you. Mr. Yoder, how do you feel about that? 25 Q

A About what, sir?

2.0

- Q About the difference in testimony between police and lay witnesses.
 - A Well, I would think that the more experience one had, the more effective of a witness they would we be. That pretty well sums that up. If somebody hasn't been in court, how can they -- be slower and more apprehensive perhaps about testimony. Maybe even (inaudible).
 - Q Okay. Mr. Miller, was it you who said would watch all the testimony come in from both sides? I think you did. You realize that both sides don't have to put on any testimony. Only one side does. How do you feel about that system of -- we're just able to do crosswords. Now that I know that, I'm going to go get some. How do you feel about that?
 - A Innocent until proven quilty.
 - Q Okay. Now you get the drift. That's what I was going for that hadn't been said so far.
 - Ms. Peachey, do you understand that as well?
- A Yes.
 - Q It's not a contest. It's not a liars contest where we have people swearing against each other. The state has to prove guilt, and there's innocence beforehand. So you have to assume that these two

people are innocent unless the state proves them guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Does that make sense?

A Yes.

- Q Okay. And, Ms. Tullis, how do you feel about that?

 Do you have any anything to add?
- A I believe what you said is exactly true. Innocent until proven guilty.
- Q So as they sit here today, let's say that we don't put any evidence on, and the state doesn't put any evidence on, and you're asked to bring in a verdict, what would your verdict be?
- A Could you turn that question a different way?
- Q Sure. And it's kind of a trick question, but I'm trying to just make a point with you here. Let's say the State of Indiana who has the burden of proof of proving guilt beyond a reasonable doubt doesn't put any proof on, doesn't put any evidence on, what would your verdict be?
- A I'm not sure. I would have to go by what I heard and seen and believe inside.
- Q Okay. I shouldn't try to trick you that way I guess. What I'm -- what I'm really saying is if the state doesn't prove its case, the verdict is not quilty.

- 1 A Correct.
- 2 Q You got that.
- 3 A Yes.
- 4 Q So if the state doesn't prove anything, what's the
- 5 verdict?
- 6 A Guilty.
- 7 Q Are you sure?
- 8 A No. I'm not sure about that question.
- 9 Q Okay. Ms. Clark, do you see what I'm going for
- 10 here?
- 11 A Yes, I do.
- 12 Q Can you say the word not quilty?
- 13 A I can say the word not guilty, yes.
- 14 Q And, Mr. Ball, would you tell us a little bit about
- 15 your service?
- 16 A I went in back in 1968, and I missed Vietnam. I
- 17 served at Desert Storm, and then I retired in '92.
- 18 Q So you put in your time for sure.
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 Q How do you feel about being in the courtroom today?
- 21 A It doesn't bother me.
- 22 Q Okay. You can still take orders?
- 23 A Yes. Pretty used to that.
- 24 Q The judge is going to give you a bunch of orders.
- They're called jury instruction. And some of what

we're doing now is going over those instructions
that we expect to be given to you to see if you'll
be able to obey those. One of the instructions
will be that because the state has the burden of
proof, the defendant doesn't have to testify in his
or her own behalf. And if the defendant chooses
not to testify, you can't hold that against him or
her. You think that you can follow that
instruction?

A Yes.

2.0

Q Does anyone have a problem? I'll tell you there usually are problems here so raise your hand if that doesn't make sense to you. Okay. It all goes in line with the fact that the state has to put on the proof and the defense doesn't have to rebut that if the state didn't prove it not guilty.

How many of you have read or heard things about the case that haven't been talked about before? I know some of you admitted hearing about the case. Any of the rest of you?

- A I heard about it on the news and in the paper when it happened, but after that I forgot about it.
- A The same thing. You know, I read it and heard about it, but after that I didn't really pay --
- Q It's like news every day, and probably if you

didn't make a great note of it it's not going to 1 2 effect your decision here. I know, Mr. Yoder, you 3 said that that effected you at the time. Yeah. When I read the first account way back in 4 Α 2002 whenever it was. 5 And was it you, Mr. Hoffman, that said you had a 6 relative -- Okay. Mr. Ball, you have a relative in 7 the Waterfall Apartments? 8 No. I think it was the Riverside. 9 Α 10 0 Okay. You think there's anything about that situation that would -- that might kick in when 11 12 you're looking at this one? 13 Α No. Because it's not a situation anymore. She's 14not living there. Okay. All right. There are a number of the things 15 16 I'd like to ask. I'm not prepared to do so because 17 Mr. Chris Crawford is going to come up, and he has a big list. So do any of you on the panel know 18 each other? All right in this group of 12, in this 19 20 group of 12 people. And I'll probably ask that each time. And do any of you have a question for 21 22 me? Thank you. 23 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Zook. Mr. Crawford. 24 MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you, your Honor.

1111

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. CRAWFORD:

2.0

Q I think this is first time in this process I've actually gone this far last, so hopefully I'll be a lot shorter because most of the questions will have already been asked. If there are any additional questions or anything for me, I will probably address that towards the end of our conversation like Mr. Zook did.

First left me ask you, I know that we had discussed setting aside our views of things based upon where we come into this particular case, but I want to know if there's anyone that has any special connection with an elderly person or a mom or a dad or another family member that may make it difficult to sit in judgement in this case because the victim in this case at the time of her death was 94 years of age. Is there anything specifically about that that would make it difficult or harder to hear this particular case in light of those circumstances? Anyone on our panel? You'll be able to set that aside and simply decide the facts of this particular case.

(The jurors indicated.)

Q Anyone on our current panel up here right now have

any friends or family members or acquaintances that 1 suffer from emotional or mental difficulties? Yes, 2 3 sir. I have sister who's mentally retarded, lives in a 4 Α 5 group home here in Goshen. Okay. Anything about that that would make it 6 7 difficult for you to decide the facts in this case? (The juror indicated.) 8 Anyone else? Ms. Peachey, anything about your 9 Q 10 involvement in Oaklawn make it difficult for you to sit in judgment in this particular case? 11 12 I don't believe so. Α 13 Had no contact with Mr. Royer at all, did you? 14Α Never. Okay. Ms. Peachey, when making a difficult 15 0 16 decision in your life, how do you go about doing 17 that? What kinds of things do you consider when doing such a process? 18 I probably weigh out the consequences of if I make 19 Α this decision what will the repercussions be long 2.0 term versus going the other route, and would try to 21 make the decision that would benefit me or my 22 23 family the most. Is that what you mean? 24 Sure. And how do you go about making -- I mean, I 25 understand the complexity of getting to that place,

but what kinds of things do you consider when 1 making those decisions? What kind of evidence or 2 3 what kind of things do you take into account before making a major decision? 4 What the cost would be financially, emotionally, 5 Α and with my family, what would benefit my family 6 7 the most and me the most, would I be happy in it, or does it just look good in the beginning but then 8 later would not be so attractive. I'm not sure you 9 10 want. 11 No. That's perfectly fine. I understand that 12 completely. Of our panel here, how many of you 13 have children? 14(The jurors indicated.) Ms. Clark, have your children ever been in a 15 0 16 situation where they kind of didn't tell you the 17 truth? 18 Of course. Α And how would you go about resolving whether or not 19 Q 2.0 your kids were telling you the truth or what the actual -- truth actually was? How would you go 21 about finding that out? 22 I pretty much would just quiz them until they tell 23 24 me the truth. I -- I don't know. You just 25 sometimes can read that they are not telling you

- the truth, and you just -- you don't let up.
 - Q Okay. What reason might they have had for their decision not to be honest with you? What might be a reason for that?
 - A Well, one was when my daughter went to an R rated movie that she wasn't supposed to do. She did something that she was not supposed to do so it was the fear of punishment of being grounded after telling the truth.
 - Q Okay. So she was just afraid so she made the decision obviously not to be truthful with you.
- 12 A Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- Q Mr. Ball, did you raise your hand as well too having children?
- 15 A Yes.
- Q Were there ever occasions when your children didn't tell you the truth?
- 18 A Lots.
- Q What would be some of the reasons behind why they didn't tell you the truth?
- 21 A Fear of punishment.
- Q Okay. Were there other reasons?
- A Taking away their freedom or things like that,
 mostly punishment.
- 25 Q Has any of our panel ever been in a situation where

2.0

we had what we thought to be a friend or an acquaintance or something tell us that wasn't truthful? Anyone ever have that? I can go first.

When I was in middle school, I had a friend that -- or I thought was a friend at the time that would constantly tell me that his father could get the Kenner Star Wars figures so I could have any of the Star Wars figures I want; however, he was never able to come up with those Star Wars figures, ever could ever come up with.

But we would go, we'd have lunch everyday in school, and he would constantly tell me that he could come up with these Star Wars figures, but he was unsuccessful. I learned later on and towards the end of the year that is father never worked for Kenner, was never a part of that company, and there was now way he could ever get any of those Star Wars figures. But at least in my mind as a youngster what I later looking back on realized that he was simply trying to find a way to get along or fit into a part of a group or something, and that was the way he thought he could do that to make himself seem more interesting perhaps.

Anybody ever have a situation like that in their own life have any friends or family members

or acquaintance of our panel? Anybody? Okay. 1 Peachey, you -- or not. I saw you nodding your 2 3 head, but if you weren't --Yes. I've been lied to by children and other 4 Α 5 people. And adults? 6 7 And adults. Α All right. What would be the reason behind why 0 8 they might have done that? 9 10 Α Most recently a friend who lied to us lied because they were afraid of what we would think of them if 11 12 we knew the truth. 13 Q Okay. So there's some kind of ulterior motive 14 there where they wanted you to still think of them in a certain way --15 16 He wanted us to still like him and accept him, but 17 he didn't want us to know what he had really done was true. 18 Okay. All right. Mr. Miller, were you shaking 19 Q 2.0 your head? Yeah. Probably along the same lines. I've been 21 Α lied to both by children and by adults. 22 23 Similarly, to try to get a higher position or have Q 24 you think of them a certain way? 25 Α Right. To fit in, try and accept them or be

friends.

2.0

- Q Much like the situation myself in middle school with that particular gentleman.
- A Yes.
- Q And people -- and so that was a similar situation for you.
- A Yes.
 - Anyone else from our panel have that happen to them? Okay. One of issues and topics that Mr.

 Zook brought up and I don't believe had been broughten up or addressed before was the issue of presumption of innocence. We talked to -- as Mr. Zook mentioned, we talked a lot about reasonable doubt initially, but nothing was really -- it wasn't specifically dealt with on the issue of presumption of innocence, and that's as Ms. Canen and Mr. Royer sit here they're are presumed innocent.

Anybody have a problem with that particular protection? Any problem using it or keeping it in your mind as you're listening to the testimony over the course of the next couple of days with the issue of presumption of innocence? Anybody have any thoughts about what it means to them? Okay. Has anybody ever had a friend, family member, or

- themselves been a victim of a crime of our panel?

 Ms. Cramer.
 - A I had an aunt and cousin murdered by my uncle.
 - Q Anything about that particular situation that would make it difficult for you to sit in this case?
 - A No.

2.0

- Q Okay. Anyone else? Yes, ma'am.
- A I had car stolen once. I had one of my cars was broke into once, and my apartment was also broken into twice over a period of 15 years.
- Q Okay. Anything -- did anything come up of that event? Did the police investigate? Did they find a suspect? How far did that go?
- A It didn't go very far that what was stolen wasn't worth very much, and the person that we thought did it had moved out of town left someplace. The one time that the car was stolen it was returned within a couple of hours. It was found and returned.
- Q Anything about that process that would make it difficult for you to separate that particular issue and sit in here and make a decision in this particular case?
- A No, I don't think so.
- Q Anyone else been the victim of crime of our panel?

 And friends or family members anything like that?

Anyone have any close -- close relationships with 1 2 anyone from any police department or prosecutor's 3 office anyone of our panel? I believe, Mr. Ball, you mentioned you worked out with is it Detective 4 5 Thayer? Any other friends that might be police officers that you've come into contact with? 6 7 Mike Bogart. I think he's a corporal. He ran the Α gym, and Steve Travis. He owned the gym so --8 Any thought or any feeling that it's -- give 9 Q 10 special deference to the testimony of police officers over anyone else because of your 11 12 involvement with these particular individuals? 13 Α No. 14 Okay. You'd be able to separate that and just simply decide the facts of this case? 15 16 Right. Α 17 Okay. Anyone else have any friends, family 18 members? Yes, ma'am. I know a couple police officers. 19 Α 20 Who do you know? Q Α Pardon me. 21 22 Q Who do you know. 23 Α Roland Tuttle from Wakarusa. I don't know if he's 24 still alive anymore. I worked for him when he 25 owned a restaurant. I'm friends with policeman in

- Indianapolis, and my ex-brother-in-law was a 1 policeman here in Elkhart -- or Goshen. I'm sorry. 2 3 Anything because of your knowledge or your familiarity with these people that would cause you 4 to give special deference to the testimony of a 5 police officer that you wouldn't otherwise? 6 7 I don't believe so. Δ Anyone else. Yes, Mr. Miller. 8 0 I know a Goshen City Police Robert Wartsler. 9 Α 10 0 Anything because of that experience that you would give more deferential treatment to the testimony of 11 12 a police officer as opposed to any other witness? 13 Α No. 14 Q How about, Mr. Enos? I have uncle that's a retired sheriff. 15 Α 16 Q Okay. Same question of you that I asked everybody 17 else. Makes no difference.
 - Q You understand, all of you understand that you're simply deciding the case based solely upon the facts and the evidence that you hear comes by the way of that chair over there?

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Α

No.

Anything else about what you've heard so far specifically about this case that would make it a difficult case for you to sit in here and to judge

over the next several days for any our panel? 1 Any questions concerning the differences or 2 3 what guilt beyond a reasonable doubt means? That was only briefly, I believe, addressed during the 4 course of Mr. Zook and Ms. Becker's time with you? Anybody have any questions about that? 6 7 Ms. Brown, I believe you mentioned that you sat on a criminal jury trial. Is that correct? 8 Yes. 9 Д 10 0 And I think if I remember correctly you also sat on 11 a civil case. Is that right? 12 Yes. Α 13 Q Okay. And there were two different standards of 14 proofs, isn't that fair to say? Pardon. 15 Α 16 There were two different proofs. One was guilt Q 17 beyond a reasonable doubt and one was by preponderance of the evidence. Did you hear that 18 19 phrase? 20 Right. Α And there was a different standard. Correct? 21 0 22 Α Yes. 23 One was more like 50 percent, more likely than not 24 on the preponderance of the evidence, and one was 25 reasonable doubt which was a higher standard.

Correct?

A Correct.

2.0

Q Everyone understand that that's what we're dealing with over the course of the next several days here a higher standard of proof and not the preponderance of the evidence. Okay.

Has any of our panel, I know that several of you mentioned that you had read things in the paper shortly after this incident took place, but of what you read in the paper, is there anything that would bias your opinion as you come in today one way or the other about making a decision without having heard all the evidence?

I guess a better way to say it has the paper swayed you one way or the other news accounts that you've heard swayed you one way or the other as opposed to taking time out and just separating that and listen to the evidence in this case? Shouldn't have any problem with that then. Correct?

(The jurors indicated.)

- Q Ms. Clark, how -- I don't know if I asked you this or not. I think I started at the end. How do you make a major decision in your life? What process do you go through in doing that?
- A I weigh the pros and cons, all the reasons why a

- decision should be made and the reasons why it should not be made, and I pray.
- Q When faced with making a critical decision, do you remain firm in your convictions or do you sway?
- A If I truly believe that what I have decided is right, I stay firm. If there's any doubt in my mind that I have not thought through everything, I can't be swayed by someone else but I can be swayed by my own thinking.
- Q Okay. Thank you. Mr. Ball, how about you? How do you make a decision in your life?
- A I just weigh, like she said, pros and cons and make the decision.
- Q Are you a firm person when you make your decision?
- A The situation could change and your decision can change.
- 17 Q Okay. How about you, Ms. Cramer?
- 18 A I weigh the pros and cons and how it's going to
 19 effect my family and my beliefs and what I believe
 20 in.
 - Q Are you more of a leader or a follower?
- 22 A I'm more of a leader.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

21

Q And will you be firm in your decision when you get
there or you keep weighing or how long a process
does it take you?

A Once I get there, I'm firm in it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- Q Is it a lengthy process to get there --
- A It depends on what decision I'm making. If it's a major lifetime then, yeah, it might take some time.

 If it's small, you know, like where I'm going to go eat.
 - Q So the larger the decision the longer period of time you're involved in it. Okay. Mr. Emerson, how about you?
 - A It's hard for me to make decisions. I mean, firm clear in my mind sometimes, you know, it's hard to decide. You have a little doubt here and there, and then you don't go through it.
- Q Are you easily swayed by people, or do you make your own mind up?
- A Both ways I guess. Sometimes easy; sometimes not.
- 17 Q Kind of depends on the situation.
- 18 A Situation, yes.
- Q Okay. Are you quick to rush to judgments or again just depend upon the circumstances?
- 21 A It depends on the circumstances.
- 22 Q Thank you, sir. How about you, Mr. Yoder?
- A Listen to all the facts pros and cons and make a
 educated decision not on -- not based on emotions
 but on the facts.

- Q Are you --
- 2 A I think I would be able to stick to my decisions,
- although I don't consider myself a leader, not
- 4 everybody can be a leader. But I have -- once a
- 5 make a decision, it would be because I was pretty
- 6 sure.

- 7 Q Based on everything you heard?
- 8 A Yes.
 - Q How about you, Mr. Enos?
- 10 A Simply look at the situation, figure out what do
- to. I just look at situation, and make a decision
- 12 whether it's right or wrong.
- Q Okay. Do you rush to a decision, or do you have to
- spend time to come up with the decision?
- 15 A How it's going to effect my life.
- 16 Q Are you a leader or a follower?
- 17 A I'm leader.
- 18 Q Okay. Thank you, sir. Ms. Oakley, how about you?
- 19 A Same as everybody else. Weigh the pros and cons,
- 20 talk to the people that are involved in the
- situation, and try to come up with what's going to
- 22 work for everybody.
- Q Okay. Mr. Miller, how about you?
- 24 A Pretty much the same thing. Pros and cons, kind of
- weigh. If I go one way, what's it going to be

- like. If I go the other, what's it going to be
 like. See which way is best.
 - Q And I think I asked you that, Mrs. Peachey. How about you, Mr. Hoffman?
 - A I prefer to pray about it, and then seek counsel from people around me that I value.
 - Q Okay. Are you pretty firm when you finally reach a decision?
- 9 A Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 10 Q Ms. Brown, how about you?
- 11 A Once I reached a decision, I'm pretty firm about it.
- Q Hard to get you to come off of that once you reach it.
- 15 A Right.
- 16 Q Is it a long or slow process?
 - A Once I have all the facts, it's not hard for me to make a decision, but I have to make everything that's going to effect it. I need to see the whole picture.
 - Q Okay. Thank you. I think that's all I have other than simply to say that if there's something that we haven't mentioned already that would make a difficult for any of our 12 people to be here over the next couple days, please say it now because

this is your last opportunity. So I quess I have 1 the privilege of being the last one that's going to 2 get to ask you that question of this particular 3 panel, and I thank you for your time. 4 (Counsel approached the bench.) THE COURT: Ms. Cramer, if you were to sit 6 7 here, listen the evidence, do you think you can make a decision in this case keeping your mind upon the business 8 here in the courtroom? 9 10 A JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: Without regard to your children, 11 12 can you pay attention here and make a decision based upon 13 all the evidence? 14 A JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. See, we need to know. 15 16 is an important case as is every case that goes to trial. 17 We need to know that we have someone sitting in the jury box who can pay attention, listen to the evidence, not 18 19 miss anything, and not be worrying about what's going on 2.0 at home. Are you that person? 21 A JUROR: I would be fine not worrying what's going on at home, but I would be worrying about -- I'm 22 23 also in college, and I would be worrying about my 24 assignments that are due too as well. 25 THE COURT: As a result of your worrying about

```
1
      college, would your mind be elsewhere while this trial is
      going on?
 2
 3
                A JUROR: Partly, yeah.
                THE COURT: All right. The following jurors
 4
      will remain the rest of you will be excused. The ones
 5
      remaining will be Judith Clark, Steve Emerson, Michael
 6
 7
      Miller, Karen Oakley, Randall Enos. The rest of you will
      be excused. Mrs. Jackson, would you seat additional
 8
      jurors. All right. Seat No. 1 we now have JoAnn Adams.
 9
10
                A JUROR: Yes.
                THE COURT: In seat No. 3 we have Kirk Beer.
11
12
                A JUROR: Yes.
13
                THE COURT: In Seat No. 4 we have Benjamin
14
      Dickey.
15
                A JUROR: Yes.
16
                THE COURT: In seat No. 6 we have Mary Combs.
                A JUROR: Correct.
17
18
                THE COURT: In seat No. 7 we have Daniel
19
      Bontrager.
2.0
                A JUROR: Yes.
21
                THE COURT: In seat No. 8 we have Maryann Keil.
                A JUROR: Yes.
22
23
                THE COURT: And in seat No. 9 we have Linda
24
      Bowser.
2.5
                A JUROR: Yes.
```

THE COURT: Ms. Becker or Mr. Williams.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. WILLIAMS:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- My name is Joel Williams, and if you didn't hear everything that was said is anybody here on the panel that's been seated, and my questions are going to be directed towards those that have just been seated. Is there anybody here that while the questioning was going on by Ms. Becker, Mr. Zook, or Mr. Crawford that something came up that they said I just have to tell the next person that comes up when I get into the jury box I just have to tell them about something. Is there anybody that had that that come about when they were listening to the questions that were asked previously?
- A I had one. She asked if we knew anybody, and my daughter went to high school with Peggy her name was Gilson I think it's Snider. I forget. But that was like in the late 70s, and I haven't seen her in umpteen years, but I thought, well, I better tell you.
- Q Is there anything about knowing that that will --
- A No, I haven't seen Peggy in ions.
 - Q Is that Peggy Snider, Posthuma possibly?
- A Posthuma. Her maiden name was Gilson.

Well. She's had many names. Well, now that you've 0 1 said that about knowing people, is there anybody 2 3 that you -- anybody else that has that that come up, a name that was registered? It's 4 5 Mr. Bontrager. Correct? I knew Brett Canen, so I've known the family. 6 7 And so how did you know Brett just a friend? Q I've grown up around the Canen's so Brett has been Α 8 around. 9 10 Q What type of relationship did you have? Just see him every once in a while, not really 11 Α 12 close or anything. 13 Q I think that when the question came up and you 14 raised your hand, do you -- do you know the defendant lana Canen? 15 16 Α Yes. 17 Did you have any type of -- what type of relationship did you have? 18 No. It was just a -- kind of see her if I was at 19 Α 20 her brother's house. How good of a friend was Brett? 21 Q Brett was just a --22 23 I'm sorry. Q 24 Α I just saw Brett every once in a while if he was 25 over at the weld shop.

Q Is there anything about knowing the Canen family that you think would effect your ability here to be fair and impartial?

A No.

Q Anybody else knowing anyone? We read a list of names at the beginning of -- Ms. Becker did. She went through a laundry list of people, 20 or 25 names. Is there anybody here that would want me to reread those names, or do you think that you all heard the names that were asked? Without any hands being raised, I will assume that the answer is no.

This case, as Ms. Becker indicated, has been charged as felony murder. And did anybody have any particular questions when that concept was talked about that -- that wants to ask me a question about it?

(The jurors indicated.)

- Q Ms. Bowser, when you think and you hear that term felony murder, what do you think of?
- A I think of a person that who has committed a murder while committing a felony. It happens kind of like after the fact, but it happened.
- Q Okay. If we use a scenario such as a bank robbery and you have different people that are involved in that robbery, let's say you have four people. One

2.0

plans the robbery, tells the others maybe the combinations to the safe in the bank, another person drives them to the location, another stands by the door and watches for the police, and one goes in and actually holds up the bank, gives the note, uses the gun, gets into the vault, and in the commission of that robbery while the one individual is in the bank, he shoots the teller. Who's responsible for that murder? Let's assume that the teller dies. Who's responsible?

- A I think they're all equally responsible if they know that the man went in with a gun and it could happen that was their decision, and I believe they're all equally guilty.
- So in the commission of that felony, robbery would be the felony, a death has occurred. That's the murder. Does anybody disagree with that? The person who's planned it, the person who's driven them there, the person who's standing in watch, anybody disagree the they're all equally responsible if the state can prove beyond a reasonable doubt all the elements of the offense, of course? Anybody disagree with that? Mrs. Keil, what do you think about that?
- A I agree. If they're all part of the planning of

the robbery, they would all be guilty.

2.0

One of other concepts that was brought up by

Ms. Becker was something called accomplice

liability, and it's kind of interwoven. In that

situation with felony murder, you've got accomplice

liability. And the definition of accomplice

liability in the State of Indiana is if you aid,

induce, or cause a person to commit an offense,

then you're just as responsible.

Now, in the scenario that I had for the bank robbery there was only one person that actually physically killed the teller. Do you have any questions about the accomplice liability the fact that the person that planned it, gave the combinations aided or induced cause they were all in the agreement, and then the person in the car was the get-away driver and the person that was at the door watching, they're aiding in that robbery? Do you have any questions about that, that concept of being responsible even though maybe not there?

- A No, I do not.
- Q Ms. Adams, what do you think?
- A Well, I feel that the person that went in with the qun and shot the person, that person should be

- charged for the murder, and the other accomplice with them would be charged too, but he would get a higher penalty because he did the murder.
- Q So the person who actually is the trigger man or woman you think that person should be punished more severely.
- A Right.

- Q Now, that brings up something about punishment, and do you understand that the judge is the one that determines punishment in the case? If it should be that the defendants are found guilty, ultimately they'll be sentenced but it's his decision and not your decision. How does that make you feel as far as knowing that there may be a punishment and you're rendering such a decision in a case?
- A It depends. I really don't go for the person to be murdered. It's against my belief on that part, but what the judge decides that's his decision. That won't be mine.
- Q Do you think that knowing that there might be a penalty for a person that you decide is guilty of an offense, do you think that would weigh on you as far as how you listen to the evidence that comes in, the testimony that's presented?

- don't know. It's kind of pretty difficult to lay aside what you believe in for that person that commit the crime.

 Q What we want to try to have you do is take all that
- clutter, that -- that stuff that you have, your experiences, you have life experience, you have common sense, you have things that you experience on the outside; and when you come in here, we are asking you to kind of set those things aside and listen to what is the evidence that's presented and not take those potential preconceived notions or your life experience so to speak and have that somehow effect what the testimony is. Do you have any questions about that?
- 15 A No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

- Q Mr. Beer, the concepts of felony murder and accomplice liability any questions?
- 18 A No.
- 19 Q Mr. Dickey, any questions?
- 20 A Nope.
- 21 Q Mr. Combs, do you have any questions?
- 22 A No.
- Q The concept that all the attorneys have already
 talked about this term beyond a reasonable doubt.
- For the -- for the people who have now been sat,

who here has heard of that -- that concept beyond a reasonable doubt?

(The jurors indicated.)

Mrs. Combs, I'm going to pick on you. When you hear that concept or you hear that term beyond a reasonable doubt, what do you think about? What does it mean to you?

- It means to me that if I were to be on the jury and I go in to deliberate, I would have to say I have to be absolutely positive in my mind that this person is either guilty or not guilty. I can't -- I couldn't sway, oh, gee, maybe he's not. I think I just would have to know for sure in my mind that he is or isn't or they are or not guilty.
- Q Would you require the state to prove beyond all doubt that the person is guilty?
- A Define all doubt, I mean, totally --
- Q Totally 100 percent.

- A You mean there's gray area that there may not be in my mind I'm not sure of. Is that what you're asking me?
- Q What I'm asking you is: When -- when -- you had said that you had to be absolutely sure in your mind. When it comes to beyond all doubt, would the state have to prove to you -- maybe I can phrase it

like this -- all doubt includes both reasonable doubt, things that are based upon reason and common sense, and it all also includes things that are unreasonable doubts. Because if you're talking about all doubt, you have reasonable and unreasonable doubt.

- A There's always got to be a little shadow of doubt.

 My, gosh, you're not God. You're don't know for sure if it's true. You have to just use your common sense and hope and pray to God that you're making the right decision, but there's always going to be, you know, nobody knows for sure. They don't know if they're lying on the stand. I don't know.
- Q Sure. I mean, there's really nothing in life that's certain. Correct?
- A Absolutely.

- Q I mean, maybe death and taxes, but -- but no -- so you're not going to hold the state to a -- to a standard that it cannot obtain?
- A Nobody could obtain a standard that's 100 percent positive that this person is or isn't guilty. I mean, it's --
- Q Sure. And that's because --

THE COURT: Mr. Williams, excuse me. We need to keep in mind that we're recording this. You can't

- both talk at the same time. If you both talk at the same
 time, we're going to end with up with nothing. Go ahead,
 Mr. Williams.
- 4 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.
- 5 BY MR. WILLIAMS:

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- Q Mr. Beer -- thank you very much -- beyond a reasonable doubt, that concept, what does it mean to you?
- A There needs to be proof, evidence. The vast
 majority of that evidence needs to lean a certain
 way to -- to prove to me that -- that they would be
 guilty or not guilty. I mean, there's gray areas
 in everything. And, like I said, the common sense
 you got to decipher out and use your common sense
 in doing that.
- Q Sure. Have you ever purchased a home?
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 Q When were purchased your home, it's a big decision.
- 19 A Correct.
- Q Did you just take a dart and throw it at a map and go to that location and say that's the house I'm buying?
- 23 A No.
- Q What did you do to -- to buy that house, a big decision in your life?

- A We built a home. We did the research on it. We had plans drawn up, we had, you know, all the things that go along with it. Researched out financing, you know, all that stuff that goes with.

 Took a lot of time to do that before we even started construction.
 - Q Had to find the property.
 - A Correct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

18

19

2.0

21

- Q So there's property, financing, builders, subcontractors, decisions all to be made inside the house as far as what you're going to put in.
- 12 A Yes.
- 13 Q Took some time.
- 14 A Yes.
- 15 Q When you collected all that information, you had to
 16 make a decision. Were you firmly convinced that
 17 you were doing the right thing?
 - A Yeah. At the time I was, yes.
 - Q So based on everything that you knew all the -- al the things that had been presented to you when you had to finally make that large decision, you were firmly convinced.
- 23 A I was able to make the decision, yes.
- Q And you'll get a jury instruction with regard to reasonable doubt and that jury instruction will

tell you that proof beyond a reasonable doubt is such that it's proof that leaves you firmly convinced in the defendant's guilt, firmly convinced.

So when you think about those big decisions that you've made and you have to come to those conclusions of making a decision or not, are you firmly convinced? Mrs. Bowser, beyond a reasonable doubt, what -- what does it mean to you?

- A I agree with what they've said. I think that the majority, the vast majority of all the evidence that's what's going to tell (inaudible).

 There will always be a shred of what if circumstance but --
- Q But when you have those what ifs, the decision that you have to make is, is that what if based on reason? Is it reasonable doubt, or is it something that's based on unreasonable doubt? If it's something, well, I wonder what -- you know, something that has nothing to do with it; but if it's in your mind if it's unreasonable, then you can't -- you can't base your decision on it.
- A I agree with that.

2.0

Q Is there anybody here that's ever put a puzzle together? Okay. Mrs. Keil, do you put a puzzle

together? 1 2 Α Yeah. I'm not a puzzle person. 3 Q Not a puzzle person. Anybody a puzzle person? Well, I think, Mr. Bontrager, you raised your hand. 4 5 You've put a puzzle together. I have put a puzzle together. 6 Α 7 Are we talking the big puzzles in the box? Q Something like 1,000 puzzle. Α 8 1000 piece puzzle. How do you know what you're 9 Q 10 going to get at the end? 11 Α Just if you work from the sides in, then you kind 12 of -- it's -- it's there, put the final pieces 13 there. 14Q Well, when you -- when you put this puzzle together, did you have -- was it in a box? 15 16 Α Yes. 17 Was the picture of what it should be on the box? 18 Α Yeah. So when you bought that puzzle you said, well, 19 Q 20 after I'm done, I should get the picture that I have if I have all the pieces. Right? What if you 21 wouldn't have had the box top, but you just had all 22 23 the pieces, and you knew all the pieces were there? 24 I think you said that you could put that puzzle

25

together. Right?

A Yeah. You just have to work out from the edges and find the -- work from the edges out. Finally develop what the picture would be. It would come to you as the time was coming and as you were building the pieces together it would come to you what the product looked like.

So you'd start with your border and your corners, kind of work you way in from the edges. At some point, do you find pieces that go together that you kind of clump, but you're not quite sure where they fit, but over time you begin to see what develops as the picture? At some point you've put the majority of the pieces of the puzzle together, but let's say there's a few pieces missing. Do you think that you can say beyond a reasonable doubt that you know what the picture is if there's just a few pieces missing?

(The juror indicated.)

Q So if let's say this picture was of a -- of a farm with a pasture and some clouds and you've got your trees and you got maybe some horses in the pasture, that was the nice scene that you had, but you're missing a piece in a tree or a piece in the sky or piece on the house, it doesn't really effect if somebody says to you, Mr. Bontrager, do you know

beyond a reasonable doubt what that picture is? 1 It wouldn't effect it at all. 2 3 Q Does anybody disagree with that when you're putting the puzzle together that you can actually put it 4 together without having the actual picture that's 5 presented, and that's really what you have in a 6 7 trial. You have evidence that will come in, and the pieces of the puzzle will have to be put 8 9 together. That's -- we will present the evidence 10 as we believe it should be presented, but you ultimately have to make the decision as to who to 11 12 believe, as to what parts of evidence you believe, 13 the credibility of witnesses; and ultimately you'll 14 have to have the puzzle put together and make that decision. Does anybody else have any questions 15 16 about reasonable doubt. Mr. Dickey? 17 Α No. No questions. Mrs. Adams, any questions? 18 Q 19 Α No. 20 Q Mr. Beer? Α 21 No. Mrs. Keil, any questions? 22 Q 23 Α No. 24 0 Has anybody here ever served as a juror again just 25 asking the persons that are no just in the panel?

- Anybody serve as a juror in either a criminal or 1 civil case? All right. Since no one's raised 2 3 their hand, I'll assume the answer is no. I want to talk about memory. Mrs. Combs, do you think you 4 have a good memory? 5 I hope so, yes. 6 Α 7 And why do you -- why do you think that? Q I can remember things in the past. I mean, I can Α 8 9 remember 25 years ago, but, you know, I can 10 remember recent things I'd like to think. Are there things that you think, and I think you've 11 Q 12 touched on those, but are there things that you 13 think actually effect your memory? 14Α Probably, lack of sleep. I don't know. The amount of time that passes? 15 0 16 Yeah. That's right. 25 years ago, when you get to Α 17 be my age. Do you think that your memory is better the closer 18 in time you are to an event? 19 20 Probably. Α So if something happened yesterday and I asked you 21 0 about what you did for dinner, your memory would be 22
 - Q It's possible you wouldn't even remember.

24

25

Α

Yeah.

better than if I asked you three years from now?

- A Oh, I'm sure I wouldn't.
- Q What about persons that may have mental
 difficulties do you think that might effect
 somebody's memory?
- 5 A You mean the person that has the mental defect?
 - Q Yes.

6

7

9

10

- A I would say it could, yes.
- 8 Q Depends on what it is?
 - A Yeah, I mean, minor things no but maybe major things.
- 11 Q When it comes to events that are important in your
 12 life, do you think that you have better memories
 13 than those that are just the mundane everyday of
 14 your life?
- 15 A I would say, yes.
 - Q You've been married?
- 17 A Correct.
- 18 Q That memory is a big event in your life, you have
 19 memories of that, but then again, what you ate
 20 three years ago not so much.
- 21 A Not so much.
- 22 Q Mr. Beer, what do you think about memory?
- A I can remember the major things. I remember

 finding a gentleman on County Road Seven when Ben

 Oak was being built that had been shot to death in

the road, and I remember -- I can tell you exactly 1 where everything was right to this day, and how it 2 3 all and what I did. That was an event that was certainly out of the 4 Q ordinary. Correct. 6 Α 7 And is it kind of a memory that was burned into Q your brain? 8 9 Α Absolutely. 10 0 And when you were -- when that memory was being created, was it something that you thought you were 11 12 going to have to remember because of the event 13 itself? 14 Α Yes. Did you call the police? 15 0 16 Α Absolutely. 17 So something that you -- you -- you can consciously say I need to remember this is going to be -- is 18 going to effect your memory rather than I'm not 19 2.0 sure if it really fits or if I really need to remember it so why do have I have to really burn it 21 into my memory? 22 23 I think that's correct. Α Do you think that a person's lack of memory if they 24 0 25 can't remember the exact details, does that mean

- that they're not telling the truth.
 - A No.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- 3 Q Mrs. Keil?
- 4 A Yes.
 - Q What do you think about memory? I had asked

 Mr. Beer about whether if someone who -- who

 doesn't necessarily can't remember all the details

 of something does that necessarily mean that

 they're not telling the truth? What do you think

 about that?
 - A No. But if it's a traumatic event, I think you would remember most all of it.
 - Q And if it's not a dramatic event, do you expect somebody to remember all of the details?
- 15 A Not necessarily.
 - Do you think our memory is burned that one that you remember; for example, the person on the side of the road that had been shot to death or something in your mind that if you know that it's significant at the time it will be easier to remember that if, let's say, you find out later on it was significant?
 - A Oh, I think it's burned immediately. We were robbed once, and I will never forget that evening.
 - Q The details of that you don't --

A Details, right.

2.0

Q If someone had -- let's say it had been something less dramatic or serious such as somebody telling you a story about something that was significant, but you really had no context for it. Somebody just tells you some story about something that happened to them on the roadway about seeing, let's say, they thought they saw a body on the roadway, or they thought they saw a animal die on the roadway. Let me tell you that story.

At the time you may not have any reason to think that that's significant, but then later on you find that is because let's say somebody committed a crime in shooting the animal. We'll use an animal for example. Do you think that there's going to be a difference in whether you felt it was significant at the time that is was told to you rather than you find out later on that is was significant? Do you think that really matters?

A Yeah. I think you would probably reflect back on it and remember that. It wouldn't be quite as dramatic if it happened to you directly, but I think it would be start putting the pieces together.

Q Mrs. Bowser, memory.

2.0

Q

- A Are you referring to the event that you just described?
 - Well, did you understand what I meant by that as far as, you know, a lot of our memories they come.

 We don't really think of it during the day of how maybe important it is, but then all of a sudden you find out later down the road that it was important, and now you got to go back and say what was it about it. What -- what do I have need to remember about that? And you're trying now to relay that to somebody and say, well, this is what I remember.

 You may not have all the details, but again do you believe that if they don't have the detail that they're not telling the truth?

A No.

THE COURT: Counsel, approach the bench, please.

(An off-the-record discussion was held at the bench.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to give you a recess for noon at this time. I need to remind you that you are all prospective jurors in this case. You are prohibited from discussing this case with anyone prior to the commencement of the evidentiary

portion of the trial. To do so may result in a mistrial.

2.0

After the presentation of evidence has begun, jurors may discuss the evidence presented amongst themselves in the jury room during recesses. All regular jurors and alternates must be present during such discussion. You must reserve judgement concerning the outcome of the case until jury deliberations begin.

You may not discuss the facts of this case with me or with the lawyers or any of the witnesses.

You may not investigate the case yourselves or attempt to obtain information outside the courtroom. It is highly improper for you to do so. You are also prohibited from reading any newspaper accounts of this case and from listening to or watching any radio or television reports relating to this trial.

You are to consider and decide this case only upon the evidence received during the course of the trial here in the courtroom.

It is six minutes after 12. I'd like to have you back in the jury room by 1:15. We'll try to get back in the courtroom at 1:30. Have a good lunch.

(A recess was taken for lunch.)

(The Court convened with all the parties present. The prospective jury entered the courtroom and the

following proceedings were had.) 1 THE COURT: Be seated, please. Mr. Williams. 2 3 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION CONTINUED BY MR. WILLIAMS: 4 Good afternoon. Hope you had a good lunch. Is anyone that's -- again, we're again talking just 6 with the persons put into the panel after the first 7 round -- has anyone been subject or participated or 8 been a witness in a lawsuit whether that be small 9 10 claims, civil case? Has anybody been involved in a -- in a case where they've actually sued somebody 11 12 or actually had to be involved in a lawsuit? I 13 take it from -- I'm sorry. Go ahead. 14 I had bankruptcy filed with my business. I don't know if that would qualify. 15 Was there anything about that being involved in the 16 Q legal system that you think would effect you in 17 this case? 18 I didn't think it was fair. 19 2.0 Q You didn't think it was fair. But that was a civil case. Right? 21 22 Yes. 23 Dealt with money. 24 Α Uh-huh. 25 Anyone else that was involved in anything, a

lawsuit of any kind? Right. I take it from no hands being raised that the answer is no to everyone else. Does anyone have any religious convictions that may prevent them from being able to sit in judgment of another person that would effect them being able to render a decision in this case?

We get your jury questionnaires provided to us before court, and one of the questions that was on that jury questionnaire dealt with that issue, and I bring it up. I saw that, Ms. Adams, you had checked the box regarding the religious convictions maybe not being able to serve as a juror. Did you -- do you remember checking that box?

A Yes.

- Q Okay. And as you sit here today, do you -- do you feel that way?
- A Maybe, yes.
- Q Is it something that you believe would prevent you from being able to sit and -- and render a verdict in -- in this case?
- A We going by, like, judging, and what I agree with the other party if this causes them to be sentences for death or something that's what we basically goes on.

- Q So if this is not a death penalty case, there's no allegation there.
- A Right.

2.0

- Q If that's not -- we're not going to be dealing with that, could you make a decision in this case?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Mr. Beer, I saw on your questionnaire the same box is checked. Can you --
 - A Similar type thing. I can -- if it's not concerning death then --
 - Q All right. All right. So if the death penalty is not involved, then you wouldn't have any problem at least being able to listen to the evidence and make a decision.
 - A Correct.
 - Q Is there anyone else? I want to talk a bit about types of evidence. There are two types of evidence. There's what we call direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. Now, direct evidence is eyewitness testimony, somebody sees something, and they tell you what they saw.

Circumstantial evidence is kind of like

putting the pieces of the puzzle together to come

up with a conclusion, to look at things and make

inferences and make a decision. Many of you have

125 children. Is that right? Mrs. Bowser, you have 1 some children. 2 3 Α Yes. Was there ever a time when your kids were growing 4 Q up that you told them that you didn't want them 5 to -- to have something to eat before dinner? 6 7 Yeah. Α Did they ever defy you and do it? 8 Of course. 9 Α 10 Q How did you know that they did it? They usually told me. 11 Α 12 Was there ever a time when you actually told them Q 13 not to eat something and then saw them eating it? 14Α Yes. And was there ever a time where you told them not 15 0 16 to eat, you didn't see them eating it, but you knew 17 based on some things at you saw that they did? 18 Yes. Α 19 Give me an example. Q 20 Α I would find candy wrappers. They were very discrete. 21 So you would say to them no candy before dinner. 22 23 Α Yes. 24 0 And then what, find candy wrappers somewhere?

I believe that happened once or twice then.

25

Α

Q Well, how did you know that they actually ate the candy?

- A I didn't know that for a fact; I just assumed that.
- Q Was it when just one of the children in particular that was doing it, or were they -- I see that you have three children. Was there an instance where it was just a single child that you were dealing with in the house, time for dinner, I don't want to eat anything and --
- A Yes. I had one problem child. The other two were pretty good.
- Q Well, how did you come to the conclusion if you think back to that to say, well, I know you had this candy before dinner?
- A They just didn't get any desert.
- Q They didn't get any desert. Was there anything though that -- did they get in trouble for not -- for having the candy before dinner?
- A It caused a lack of trust between us. I think that's the main problem it created. I did not punish them though.
- Q So if we use a situation like that where you actually see your child after you've told them don't have any candy and you see them actually eating the candy, you have eyewitness testimony.

```
You would say that's direct evidence. But when you
 1
            don't see it but you're able to determine that they
 2
            did it eat it; for example, you were -- that was
 3
            the only child home. You didn't eat the candy. No
 4
            animals or pets in the house. Candy was there,
 5
            candy's gone, candy wrapper. Based on all that,
 6
            you -- your life experience, your common sense, you
 7
            come to a conclusion, and that's circumstantial
 8
            evidence.
 9
10
        Α
            Yes.
            Does anybody have any questions about that the
11
        Q
12
            differences between the two? Ms. Combs, any
13
            questions about that?
14
        Α
           No no.
            Mr. Dickey?
15
        0
16
        Α
            No.
17
        0
            Mr. Beers?
18
        Α
            No.
            Mr. Adams?
19
        Q
20
        Α
            No.
            Mr. Bontrager.
21
        0
                      (The juror indicated.)
22
23
            Mrs. Keil?
24
        Α
            No.
            Under the law direct evidence and circumstantial
25
```

128 1 evidence are equal. There's no difference between the two. Mr. Dickey, you have a child. 2 3 Α Yes. How old? 4 5 Α Three. Three. Is he or she of the age that she would know 6 7 or be able to -- to, I guess, tell you the truth or not tell you the truth, or is she still too young? 8 He is a too young still. 9 Α 10 Q A little too young. Mr. Beer, you have a child? 11 Α Yes. 12 Q Six years old? 13 Α Seven. 14 Q Same question to you. Does he or she -- is it a 15 he? 16 Α He. 17 0 Does he know the difference between, I guess, the truth and a lie? 18 19 Α Yes. 20 Q And -- and how do you go about determining potentially your child not telling you the truth? 21 Questions. 22 Α 23 Q Questioning you? 24 Α Questioning, yes.

And trying to get the answers.

25

Q

- 1 A Yes.
- Q Is there something about those answers that lead
 you to believe that he is not telling you the
 truth?
- 5 A Yeah. The stories don't match up.
 - Q The stories don't match up. Mrs. Combs, you have some children?
- 8 A I have three adult children.
- 9 Q Three adult children. Any time when they were
 10 growing up that they didn't tell you the truth?
- 11 A Yes.

7

16

- 12 Q How did -- how did you determine that they didn't tell you the truth?
- A Well, when you have three, they'll tattle for one thing.
 - Q Somebody always opens their mouth and says something about it.
- 18 A Right.
- 20 So you were able to go to somebody else, one of your other children, get information, and lead you to believe that they weren't telling you the truth.
- 22 A Correct.
- 23 Q Any other way?
- A Sometimes you can get their body language and
 just -- you just know they're lying. You know, you

- know you're children. You know they're not telling you the truth.
 - Q So you know it when you see it?
 - A Sometimes basically.
 - Q Not all the time, but that's a factor that you might look at.
 - A That's right.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q Mrs. Bowser, how about you, when your kids maybe didn't tell you the truth, how did you make that determination?
- A It was hard with the girls. They were a little devious. My son I could always tell when something came out of his mouth I knew it was the truth. If I confronted him, I knew. I just knew the children. You know your kids, and you can tell the way they shift their eyes around, and they aren't looking you straight and telling you the truth. I
- 19 Q You look to see if things make sense.
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Q You use your common sense.

could tell.

- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q Life experience.
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q Things don't add up, it may not be a truth.

- Α Correct. 1 Does anybody think that the fact that they have to 2 determine the credibility of witnesses in this 3 case, they have to listen to testimony and 4 determine if someone is telling the truth or not, 5 does anybody think that they'd have difficulty with 6 7 that? Mr. Beer, do you think you'd had any problem with that? 8 9 Α No. 10 Q Mr. Dickey? 11 Α No. 12 Q Ms. Adams? 13 Α No. 14 Q Ms. Bowser, any problem with that? I don't think so --15 Α All right. Well, when you say I don't think so 16 Q what --17 18
 - A I mean, you have to trust them that they're telling the truth under oath. That's all you can do. If it doesn't add up, then you begin to suspect.
 - Q All right. And you think you can do that listen to the testimony and make those decisions?
- 23 A Yes.

20

21

- 24 Q Mrs. Keil any problem with that?
- 25 A Keil.

- Q Mrs. Keil, any problem with that?
- 2 A No. They usually have a guilty look on their face.
- 3 Q I'm sorry.

7

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

- A They would usually have a guilty look on their
 face, and you could pick it up if someone else
 didn't tell on them.
 - Q And you're talking about your children.
- 8 A Right, yeah.
 - Q Mr. Bontrager, any reason to believe that that would be difficult?
- 11 A No.
- 12 Q Mrs. Combs.
- 13 A No.
 - One of the things that you'll eventually get instructed on, a jury instruction that you'll get in this case is dealing with sympathy; and the Court will instruct you that neither sympathy nor prejudice is to effect your decision in this case for either the victim or the defendants. Does everybody understand that sympathy is not to be part of your decision making process? Does anybody have any problem with that that you have to just look at the evidence and the facts presented and the testimony and make that decision? Ms. Adams,

do you have any problem with that?

1 A I might have.

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- Q Why do you say that?
- A It all depends on the situation of that person.
- 4 What their ability are.
 - Q What their ability is. And that may effect you depending on -- when you say ability, what type of ability?
 - A They mind, if they know exactly what they was doing, they really had a good understanding of what was going on at that time.
 - Q And so if you made those determinations, that
 may -- even though it's not a legal defense that
 they're insane or that you're instructed regarding
 that, do you think that might have some effect on
 your ability to decide?
 - A Yes.
- Q I appreciate your answer. Mr. Beer, any problem with that facts?
- 19 A No.
- 20 Q Mr. Dickey?
- 21 A No.
- 22 Q Mrs. Keil, any problem with that.
- A No. I still say, you know, at least with my own
 I've known even my two and a half year old
- granddaughter, I can tell when they're guilty or

something.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

- Q So you think you're a pretty good judge of that.

 All right. Mrs. Bowser?
- A Given the age of the victim I think I would be sympathetic just because of the age and the vulnerability of that. I can't help that.
- Q So that's something that would weigh on you. That a fact. I mean, so that's one of the facts that's involved. The question is can you set aside that preconceived sympathy and say I'm not going to let that creep in and make my decision on what the evidence is. That's going to be so overwhelming and that's why I'm making this decision and not listen to anything else that's going on?
- A I don't think that would effect that ability.
- Q Because we all come here with -- from different environments and life experiences, and we have potential parents and grandparents, and that's -that's each and everyone of us. So knowing that you may have that in your mind right now, do you believe you could be fair and impartial to the defendants without having ever heard any of the evidence?
- A At this point I think I could, yes.
- 25 O Mr. Combs?

A I believe I can.

2.0

Q Do any of you have any strong feelings about law enforcement, lawyers, persons with mental deficiencies, or people that are of lower socioeconomic means than yourself? Does anyone have any strong feelings about those? I take it from no hands being raised that the answer is no to that question.

Mrs. Keil, on your jury questionnaire you had written down that you have a father, I believe, that's in a nursing home right now.

- A Seven years.
- Q How long?
- A Seven years. He's had hospice since November.
- Q All right. Do you have some concerns about being here?
- 17 A I sure do.
- 18 Q And what are the concerns?
 - A First of all, we had a scare we thought he was gone three weeks ago. They've had him on oxygen for a long time. They had to change it to liquid oxygen.

 And he's in southern Indiana, and I told him that I would have to be there. He's the only parent I have left. My mother was killed in a car accident in '82, and so I definitely would -- am concerned

- about him. We go done there as often as we can.
- Q Sure. Is his condition as of today something that young think -- is -- is potentially something going to happen?
- A Yes. It's worsened because they had to put him on liquid oxygen last week.
- Q Knowing that your father is in this nursing home and it's in southern Indiana and you're going to be here if picked for the jury until potentially Thursday, do you think that that -- having that, I guess, over your head is going to effect your ability to be able to sit and listen to what goes on in the courtroom?
- Moving to Grand Rapids because my husband has no job. He told me a little bit ago he sold the house for less than we expected to, but we got to move on. So we need get up and there find something before they tell us that they want us out in 30 days. With no job, we couldn't go find something until we're sure (inaudible) so I do have a lot on my minds. We just had a wedding last weekend so I got --
- Q Much on your mind.

2.0

A My suitcases are packed. They stayed packed

1 because of my dad.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- Q Are you planning on moving this week or going up
 there this week --
 - A We will be going to Grand Rapids this week as soon as I am released.
 - Q I guess what it boils down to is knowing all this stuff on your mind and trying to be as honest as possible, and I know you will be, but do you think that you could sit here for three days and give 100 percent attention to the testimony and to this case with all those things on your mind?
- 12 A No, I do not.
- Q Thank you. Mrs. Bowser, what do you like to do in you free to time?
- 15 A I don't have much of it; but when I do gardening,
 16 bike riding, spend time with my grandchildren.
- 17 Q How many grandchildren?
- 18 A Two granddaughters.
- 19 Q Do you watch any particular TV shows.
- 20 A Very little.
- 21 Q Not much time for TV?
- 22 A No.
- Q Mr. Bontrager, what do you like to do in your free time?
- 25 A I coach wrestling.

- 1 Q Coach wrestling. Where do you coach wrestling?
- 2 A I just got an assistance coach job at Central.
- 4 A Yeah.
- 5 Q So when does the season start?
- A The season doesn't start until September. We just
- 7 stopped our workouts until September.
- 8 Q So it's not going to effect you ability to be here
- 9 or anything like that?
- 10 A No.
- 11 Q Do you watch much TV?
- 12 A Not really.
- 13 Q Play any video games?
- 14 A Yeah. Play a lot of the video games.
- Q What kinds of video games?
- 16 A Mostly sports.
- 17 Q Mostly ports. Any anything in particular?
- 18 A Football.
- 19 Q Football. Ms. Adams, what do you like to do in
- 20 your free time?
- 21 A Gardening church.
- 22 Q Church. Any time for TV?
- 23 A Yes, some.
- Q What's your favorite TV show?
- 25 A Law and Order.

```
Law and Order. Well, I quarantee you that the
 1
            process doesn't go as quick as it does in
 2
            Law and Order. It takes much longer, and it's
 3
            probably not as exciting. Is there anything about
 4
            the Law and Order or anything that comes to mind
 5
            that you think would be problematic in this case?
 6
 7
        Α
            No.
            Mr. Beer, what do you like to do in your free time?
 8
            Camping, sporting events.
 9
        A
10
        Q
            Any particular sporting events?
            Basketball, football, Nascar.
11
        Α
12
        Q
            And when you say camping, is that actual going out
13
            in a tent?
14
        Α
            No.
            What kind --
15
        0
16
        Α
            Travel trailer.
17
        0
            Travel trailer.
18
        Α
            Yes.
            All right. Any time for TV?
19
        Q
20
        Α
            In the evenings.
            And anything in particular that you like to watch?
21
        Q
            Baseball.
22
        Α
23
            Do you have a favorite team?
24
        Α
            Red Sox.
            Red Sox. How about -- how about you, Mr. Dickey,
25
```

- 140 1 anything in particular that you like to do in your 2 free time? 3 Α Camping and work on cars. What kind of cars? 4 Q Classic. 5 Α Classic. And do you have much time for TV? 6 Q 7 Α Nope. When you do or if you have any time, do you watch 8 0 anything in particular? 9 10 Α Just whatever is on. And finally, Ms. Combs? 11 Q 12 Α Well, I like to walk, and I volunteer at the 13 hospital, you know. Elkhart General Hospital I 14 volunteer at. And what did you do for them as a volunteer? 15 0 16 Α I am in the gift slop. Do all the gift shop 17 purchases and stuff like that, and I go to shows and that type of thing. 18 Do you have a lot of time for TV? 19 Q 20 Α In the evening, I do watch some T.V. Anything in particular? 21 Q I watch 24. 22 Α 23 Q 24. 24 Α And House. Two of my favorite shows.

Do you think there's anything in particular that

25

Q

- would make you a good juror in this case?
- 2 A I good juror.

- Q A good juror, or on the flip side a bad juror.
- A I'd like to think I'd be a good juror. I'd like to think I have an open mind, wait until the end and then make a decision. I don't know. I just really think -- I have never been on a jury before, but I would give it my best.
 - Q All right. And that's all we would ask. That's all we would ask. And, Mr. Beer, anything that would make you a particularly good juror, or I guess, a poor juror? I won't say bad juror. It sounds bad.
 - A I have to make decisions everyday in the business
 I'm in so, and I have to decipher out the
 information there that I'm given so.
 - Q What type of business are you in?
- 18 A Sales.
 - Q Sales. What kind of decisions do you have to make?

 Give me an example of your decision making process.
 - A Well, I'm in charge of people within the dealership and besides selling. So I've got -- I've got to not only, you know, be able to sell to people.

 I've got to coordinate how their vehicles get taken
- care of and done and serviced an so forth.

142 0 Customer service? 1 2 Α Yeah. 3 Q So you sell cars? А Yes. 4 Mr. Dickey, anything that you believe would make 5 Q you a particularly great juror? 6 My decision making. That's about it. 7 Α And decision making in what areas? 0 8 Of what people say and try to explain. 9 Α 10 0 And do you -- do much decision making in your job or --11 12 At work I do it almost everyday. Α 13 Q And what's your work? 14 Α Automotive technician. Diagnose problems with cars and then make decisions 15 0 16 on how you fix them and what you have to do. 17 Α Yes. Mr. Bontrager, anything in particular that would 18 Q make you a good juror or the opposite? 19 20 Α I'm open minded. I listen to both sides before I even to come to a reality what I think happened. I 21 just want to make sure I have all the facts and 22 23 just open-minded. 24 All right. Mrs. Bowser?

I'd like to think I would be fair to all the

```
1
            parties involved and be as fair as I can and try to
 2
            make the right decision and pray about it.
            Is there anything that any of you want to tell me
 3
        Q
            something that I didn't ask because again as
 4
            Ms. Becking said we don't know every question to
 5
 6
            ask or what it is that maybe you want to tell us
 7
            that I just haven't asked; and is there anything
            that you think would be pertinent where you want me
 8
            to know, want us to know, this is the time to tell
 9
            us? Ms. Combs, anything?
10
            Nothing comes to mind.
11
        Α
12
        Q
            Mr. Dickey?
13
        Α
            No.
14
        Q
            Mr. Beer?
15
            No.
        Α
            Ms. Adams?
16
17
        Α
            No.
18
        Q
            Mr. Bontrager?
19
                      (The juror indicated.)
20
        Q
            Ms. Keil?
21
        Α
            No.
            Mrs. Bowser?
22
23
        Α
            No.
24
        0
            Thank you very much.
2.5
                THE COURT: Mr. Zook.
```

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. ZOOK:

1

- Q Well, it's nice getting back from lunch. Everybody
- is energized and ready to go. And this is an
- 5 interesting process, isn't it? In the new panel of
- people, you're still new by the way, who in the new
- 7 panel has known somebody or been a person who has
- been associated as a victim in a violent crime?
- 9 Nobody. No violent crimes. You already talked
- 10 about it a little bit.
- 11 A I know somebody, yeah.
- 12 Q I couldn't hear a thing you said when I was back
- there. Can you tell me what that was? The crime.
- 14 A The crime of someone I know?
- 15 Q Yeah.
- 16 A My first cousin. She accidentally murdered her
- 17 husband.
- 18 Q Okay. Okay. Was she convicted of that?
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 Q Did she go to a trial?
- 21 A Yes.
- Q Okay. Did you feel that was right?
- 23 A Yes.
- 24 Q Okay. The two words accident and murder don't
- 25 really go together.

- A They accused her for murder. They put her for murder.
 - Q And the jury found that she really did?
- A Yes.

2.0

- Q Okay. Was that in this state?
- A No Illinois.
- Q Okay. Their laws might be a little different over there. I don't know what they're like. Over here you might be wondering about second degree, first degree, things like that. We don't have that anymore. Since '77 we just had one kind of murder, and that's just murder. Try to speed it up for Ms. Combs. Okay.

To explain a little bit about what we're doing, I'd like to put it in these terms.

Everything has checks and balances. There's been an arrest, now we're going to be the balance to balance out the prosecution, but you're going to be the check. The idea is you check and see what's been done, check and see whether the evidence proves proved beyond a reasonable doubt. So it's important that even if you start out thinking police are always right you need to check on that. You must have had a lot of to eat?

A Why?

- Q Because you're kind of drifting off here.
- 2 A No, I'm not. I listened to every word you said, 3 and I listened to every word Mr. Williams said.
 - Q Okay. What did you do in the community schools?
 - A I didn't work for the schools.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

17

18

19

2.0

21

- Q Excuse me. I'm thinking of woman down there. I'm sorry. You passed that test.
- A I knew I wasn't in school.
- Q But I did mean to ask. You are retired, and your husband is retired. What did you do?
 - A I worked for a data processing company the last ten years of my employment, then I worked at a bank.
- Q Okay. Where did you work?
- 14 A I worked -- Ameritrust it was called at that time.

 15 Then I worked at ISI.
- 16 Q I didn't know that?
 - A It is a company that does payroll checks for other, you know, for different companies.
 - Q Okay. If you had it to do over and you could choose anything you wanted and you could be retrained not that you really want to work now I understand, but let's say you could do it over.
- Free education and go into whatever you want. What
- 24 would that be?
- 25 A I think I like the computer a lot, but I also like

- the medical field. It would be -- I really enjoy 1 working at the hospital and that type of thing. Anything that I would like to do would be probably 3 associated with people. One on one commorodity. I wouldn't want to be by myself.
 - You seem a little bit social.
 - Α Correct.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- Okay. How would your husband describe you? 0
- Wonderful. No. My husband is not real well, so Α I'm kind of caregiver. Not a caregiver, but he's well enough to get around, but he depends on me a lot.
- Q Okay. Is everything going the way you hoped it would?
- Yes, it is. Α
 - Good. There's something that was said the last Q time through that made me wondering and got my ears to listening again and that was that you should leave everything at the courtroom door and when you come in here listen to us, look at the instructions, and just pay attention to that. You don't have to leave your common sense at the courtroom door. As a matter of fact, that will serve you well here. You need to keep your common sense about you. That's why there are 12 of you

here with different experiences. And, JoAnn, I 1 2 understand that you work at Elkhart Community 3 Schools. Yes. 4 Α 5 What is it that you do? Q I'm a paraprofessional. 6 Α 7 Doing what? Q Α Working with the teachers and the students. I work 8 with special ed. 9 10 Q Okay. That's pretty special. And are you doing that now or during the school year? 11 12 I'm doing it during the school year. So I start in Α 13 two weeks. 14Q All right. Are you working at Elder Beerman now? 15 Α Yes. 16 What do you like about this job in the school? Q 17 Α I like working with the students, the teacher. I assisted the children that need help in classes. 18 If they, you know, slow I work with emotional 19 20 mildly, LD. I work with all of them. Okay. Do you believe that this incident that 21 Q happened to a relative of yours would color how you 22 23 view this case? Do you think that would effect it 24 at all? 25 Α No.

- Q And you could judge this case impartially?
- 2 A Yes.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

- Q Do you think you could give our clients a presumption of innocence all through the trial and then look at the evidence at the end to see what happened?
- 7 A Yes.
 - Q You think you can obey all the judge's instructions?
 - A Yes.
 - Q How about the instruction concerning the fact that the defense doesn't have to present a defense, the defendant does not have to testify, and you can't hold that against the defendant? How does that strike you?
 - A Okay. I mean, they're not able, and they don't want them to testify, if they go on the facts that they are not able to get on the stand.
 - Q Okay. And you wouldn't hold that against the person or make an inference that the person is guilty simply because the person didn't testify?
 - A Right.
- Q Okay. Lets' see here, Mr. Bontrager. How do you feel about that idea?
- 25 A That if they don't testify, I think it's fine. I

150 mean, if they don't feel they have to testify, then 1 I'm not going to judge them to be guilty 2 3 automatically. All right. Do you think that you can keep from 4 Q 5 using that presumption or that thought against them entirely? 6 7 Yes. Α Just go with the stuff that's been presented to you 0 8 not the stuff that hasn't. 9 10 Α Yes. And, Mr. Beer, how about yourself? 11 Q 12 Same thing. Α 13 Q You'd had a -- you'd had a pretty traumatic event 14happen to you. Do you think that's colored your view of anything? 15 16 No. It's been many, many years ago. Α 17 How old were you? I would have been 20 at the time. 18 Α 19 Wow. So you must have gotten a medal from your Q 20 parents. I don't know about that. 21 Α 22 Q That's great. Okay. Now, there are going to be 23 some photographs I anticipate. I assume the state 24 is going to introduce some photographs that are

kind of gory, and those are introduced to show you

- what happened. Does anyone -- I think you probably would be used to such a thing by this time.
- A Right.

- Q Our fear as defense attorneys is that the fact that photos are gory may lead you to think somebody's got to be held accountable and these two are the ones here, but there may be people that are so effected by those photographs that they actually can get physically sick. Do any of you feel that you are that type of person? Wouldn't be able to look at the photographs. Okay.
- A I might be.
- Q Okay. Thank you. I expect that it would show the decedent, who is a 94-year-old person, on the floor with ligature marks on her neck and some other --
- A My dad is 91.
- Q Okay. You think that might be a little too personal for you?
- 19 A Probably.
 - Q If you were a defendant being tried here in court and you were on trial for murder, would you want someone in your frame of mind on your jury?
 - A Not if they were biassed.
 - Q Not if they were biassed. Do you feel you're biassed, or are you just running on a short time?

- A No. I've cut myself with a razor blade and had

 problems so. I'm not a nurse. That sort of might

 bother me. Just basically the fact.
- Q Okay. Thanks, Ms. Keil. Mr. Bontrager, are you a memBer of any organizations?
- 6 A No.
- 7 Q Boy Scouts?
- 8 A No.
- 9 Q Okay. And, Mrs. Bowser, how about yourself?
- 10 A I belong to our church that's all.
- 11 Q Ms. Adams?
- 12 A Church co-pastor.
- 13 Q Co-pastor?
- 14 A Yes.
- 15 Q You sing in the choir?
- 16 A No.
- Q Don't have that talent. And, Mr. Beer?
- 18 A I'm a member of First Baptist Church in Elkhart.
- 19 Q Are you member of anything else?
- 20 A Involved in a lot of different organizations, but
- 21 not a member of them.
- 22 Q Do you get any magazines?
- 23 A Uh-huh.
- Q What are those?
- 25 A Sports magazines, and a couple of different car

153 magazines. 1 Okay. Cars seem to be running through the jury 2 3 here, like custom cars and old cars. And, Mr. Dickey, tell us about your car you're working on 4 5 now? '78 Celica GT. It's got a blown motor. 6 7 You had a blown motor. Can you put a new motor Q into cars yourself? 8 Yes. 9 Α 10 Q You got the stuff to do it? At work I do. 11 А 12 So this is after work type things? 13 Α Yes. 14 Q What is it that attracts you to do that? It's always been my passion since I was four years 15 Α 16 old. 17 If there was anything else you could train to go into, what would it be free? 18 Framing houses. 19 Α 20 Okay. Have you ever worked in that area? Q Two years. 21 Α Okay. Now, it was also said that there's no 22 23 difference between direct and circumstantial 24 evidence. Do you understand what the prosecutor 25 was talking about with that?

- 1 A Yes.
- 2 Q Did that make sense?
- 3 A Yes.
- Q If you find a dog with pie on its face, you might conclude that the dog ate the pie.
- 6 A Yes.

8

9

10

11

12

13

18

19

- Q There -- in some cases there can be a difference between those two things, not in general; but if there's going to be a difference in the direct and circumstantial evidence, you'll probably get an instruction on that. All of you would receive that. Okay. Now, I think you're probably the life of this party?
- 14 A Thank you.
- 15 Q Have any of you new panel members been on a jury
 16 before? Do any of you have any relatives who are
 17 law enforcement officers? Yes, Mr. Dickey.
 - A My grandfather works in the personnel at the Elkhart Police Department.
 - Q What's his name?
- 21 A Tom Cal.
- Q Okay. Do you think that that would make any
 difference as far as the way you view the police
 that testify here?
- 25 A No.

- Q How do you think police testimony and lay testimony compares?
- A Better with the truth.
 - Q You think police are better with the truth?
- 5 A They should be.
 - Q Do you think they are with the exception of your grandfather?
- 8 A Yes.

2

3

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

- Q Okay. We're here to test that and to see if the police case that's coming to you is a legitimate case or not. Understand that? So do you think you could discern if there was someone lying to you whether that person is a policeman or not or whether that person is fabricating or adding a little to the evidence?
- 16 A Yes.
 - Q You need to be able to look into that. And,
 Mr. Bontrager, how about yourself? Were you
 raising your hand?
 - A Yeah. My uncle was a DNR office in Lagrange County.
- 22 Q Those guys are rough?
- 23 A Yeah, a little bit.
- Q Have you discussed his cases with him?
- 25 A No, we don't talk -- only thing that's ever came up

- is one time he had to rope a boat in the middle of a lake because nobody was on it so he roped, and brought it back in.
- Q Somebody's got to do it. Okay. Any questions with the five of you or any thoughts about the fact that you might end up being the one juror holding out when 11 other people say either guilty or not guilty and you say the opposite? Mr. Dickey, how do you think you would respond in a situation like that?
- A Well, it all depends on the facts.
 - Q Well, let's say that you still believe that you're right and they're wrong, but you're only by yourself, and they have 11 supporters. One thing we need here is a unanimous verdict not -- not 12 or not 11 to one and not seven to five. You know how you would handle that?
- A No.

- 19 Q Okay. Mr. Beers?
 - A Again, I would go based upon the facts and make my decision.
 - Q Okay. And one thing that we sometimes say is each one of you makes your own verdict, and you talk among yourselves and perhaps try to sway each other by giving facts to show that you're right; but in

- the end if you still feel that you are right, would
 you hold that verdict for yourself?
 - A Yeah.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

17

18

19

2.0

- Q And you wouldn't give in simply to prevent a disagreement between the jurors.
 - A Correct.
 - Q Do any of the new members feel that if the other 11 are against you that that means that therefore you're wrong? Okay. Do any of you know each other on the current panel?
- 11 A We know each other from church.
 - Q Same church. Do either of you feel -- well, I know how churches are, and sometimes there's this -- not between you two.
- 15 A No.
- 16 A No.
 - Q So if one of you decides one way, the other one isn't going to follow suit, or the other one isn't going to simply decide the other way to give you spite?
- 21 A No.
- 22 A No.
- Q Do any of you have a question for me?
- A Mr. Beer and I know each other as well. He was my daughter's little league coach this summer?

1 I know Mrs. Oakley? Α And I know Mr. Beer. 2 Α 3 Q Are you all like in the same church or something? Mrs. Oakley's brother is married to my youngest 4 А daughter, and they live in Indianapolis? 5 This might be the fastest verdict ever. 6 7 She worked with my wife for many years. Α Do any of you feel a little constrained as to what 8 0 you can do back in the jury room because you know 9 10 each other? 11 Α No. 12 Α No. 13 Α No. And can you keep that out of your deliberation, 14 Q keep an independent verdict for yourselves? 15 16 Α Yes. 17 Now, have any questions of me. Thank you. THE COURT: Mr. Crawford. 18 19 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 20 BY MR. CRAWFORD: 21 Mrs. Adams, you mentioned you work with Elkhart 0 Community Schools. Is that correct? 22 23 Α Yes. 24 And you were worked as a paraprofessional. 25 Correct?

A Yes.

2.0

- Q As a paraprofessional with the special education students, what are your responsibilities?
- A I work with each student to make sure they get all their assignments. If the students need help in the class, I assist them. I read the tests to them. If they need help, we take them to another room so they can make sure they have plenty of time to work on they test. It all depends on the IEP.

 That's what we do requirement on. All the students have that.
- Q What kind of special needs have these children had that you've had to work with?
- A Learning disability, might be LD, (inaudible) score on their test. They might have problems with the test whether it have to be modified for them to do well on the test. Some of them are really slow.

 They might not be able to read well, they might be slow reading, writing, math. That's most of the problems they have.
- Q Did you -- did you have to have special training to deal with these kids?
- A Yes. I had to have some education. I go to seminars, learn how to work with them. Some of them emotional that means they have behavioral

160 problems. You have to learn out how to deal with 1 2 those. 3 Q Okay. So they're special needs that these children would have, and you had to specifically learn how 4 to deal with. Is that correct? 5 Α Yes. 6 7 And how long have you been involved in that Q process? 8 9 Α Almost six years. 10 0 And have you constantly been learning throughout the period of time that you've been involved with 11 12 special ed students? 13 Α Yes. 14 Okay. Thank you, ma'am. Mr. Beer, it's been a while since you were up here, and I think I heard 15 this, but you had mentioned dealing with a 16 traumatic event, was that correct, of seeing a 17 person wo was deceased and having to call the 18 police. Is that correct? 19 20 А Yes. And I believe you had mentioned that remembered an 21 Q 22 awful lot about that. Is that right? 23 Α Yes. 24 0 Because of the event itself. Is that correct?

25

Α

Correct.

- Q You mentioned that your memory was pretty good about that because of that reason. Right?
- A Yes.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q And that happened some time ago, didn't it?
- 5 A Yes.
 - Q Do you find that in your own life more traumatic events are easier for you to remember, or are there special things about certain things that's easier for you to remember?
 - A More traumatic events are easier to remember. I'm sure there are some certain things that I forget, you know, from 1987; but I can tell you exactly still on the road where that truck was and so forth.
 - Q How did you react when you saw that? Were you pretty tense or were you pretty anxious or did it change your emotions in anyway?
 - A Obviously, yes. I mean, when you see a gun laying on the road and you see a person's chest wide open, why you get a little bit racy.
 - Q Okay. So you were anxious.
- 22 A Yeah.
- 23 Q And that happened how many years ago?
- A Well, it was the first murder in Elkhart County of 1987.

- Q I believe in reviewing your questionnaire as well too you had indicated that there were some, I guess, some issues in the past with this system involving your brother-in-law. Is that correct?
- 5 A Yes.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

16

17

18

- Q Okay. And I believe there -- was that issue resolved by way of a court hearing or --
- A Yes. He was -- he was sent to prison for about two years.
- Q Were you actively involved in that?
- 11 A No.
 - Q Anything as a result of that situation that would make it difficult for you to sit as a juror in this particular case?
- 15 A No.
 - Q You mention you were not actively involved so you weren't at the Court proceedings and stuff of that nature, or were you?
- 19 A No, I was not.
- Q Have any of our panel ever been on the jury before?

 I don't know if anybody asked that. I couldn't

 remember if that's come up along the way? Any

 other experience with a jury duty other than today

 of our four or five new people?
 - A I've been called twice never into the box.

- Q First time into the box. Okay. Or have you actually been in the box?
 - A No. I have never been in the box.
- Q Is it as exciting to sit up here as it was to sit back there?
- 6 A Yeah.

2

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- Q Do you want to be in the box?
- 8 A I'm here.
 - Q Anything that you can think that perhaps would make you believe a good juror in a case such as this or not a good juror in a case such as this?
 - A I think I would be open minded and listen to all the facts.
 - Q Okay. Anything going on at home right now that would make it difficult for you to give your undivided attention?
 - A The only thing I've going right now is I'm in sales; and if I'm not there, I don't make a living.
 - Q I understand that. Is that going to be too much weighing on your mind because you heard Ms. Becker say this is a pretty complicated case?
 - A I don't think so. I think I got good enough people around me to help me.
 - Q Well, do you benefit by not being there, or is it only exclusively based upon your performance while

- being there at your job?
- 2 A We help each other out a lot. We're pretty unique.
 - Q Okay. So if there's -- you mention you're in sales. Correct?
 - A Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

18

19

2.0

21

- Q Are you -- will you still make a part of whatever profit's generated, or is that only when you're there you get a profit?
 - A No. I would -- if I was here, I would still continue to get --
 - Q Because I can assure you what you get here will not be anywhere near probably what you get there.
- 13 A I understand.
- Q Okay. So that won't be really an issue. You're
 not worried about losing sales yourself. You have
 an active amount of other people there that can
 keep it up.
 - A Correct.
 - Q Now, I believe you mention also too that your religious convictions would not be something that would make it difficult for you to finally have to make a decision. Correct?
- 23 A Correct.
- Q Okay. Thank you, sir. I appreciate it. Ms. Keil,
 I believe you mentioned the issues concerning your

- father being in southern Indiana, and I do note that I checked on that when I looked at your questionnaire with some concern over that particular issue. Is that going to be something again that's going to weigh pretty heavy on your mind in making a decision in this case? I think probably the worst time in my life Α for me to have to be here especially since we have to move and everything else on top of it. 0 Okay. I appreciate that, ma'am. Thank you. Mrs. Bowser, in reviewing your questionnaire as well too I noted some things concerning some potentially being a victim of a certain action in a the past with somebody out of is it Grand Rapids,
- 16 A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Q Is the fact that you or others were involved in that situation going to make it difficult for you to sit in a -- in a criminal case?

Michigan or a family member that was --

- A No.
 - Q Is that something that you can completely separate from what you have to resolve over the next couple of days in this case?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q I had spoken with Mrs. Keil about her father, but

2.0

is there anyone else that has a very close connection to a friend or family member that's -- a little more like Ms. Sailor's age in this case, 94 years of age, that would make it difficult for you to sit in a case like this and separate emotions you might have because of that situation of our new panel members? Okay. I will assume since no one has raised their hand or said something that that's not going to be an issue, that you'll be able to separate those two particular matters.

Other than the being a victim of a violent crime or what I've spoken about with other people, has anyone else had a friend or family member that has been the victim of any kind of crime whatsoever of our new panel? Okay. I will assume no one else has, or we've already talked about that.

Has anyone ever been a witness in a case before of our new panel? Of what we have mentioned so far, is there anyone else that has anything going on at home or work now of our new panel that would make it difficult for you to consider the facts of this case over the next couple of days?

Anything at home, work. Okay. Thank you.

I believe some of you mentioned that you did know some police officers and had had some contact

with police officers in the past of our new panel.

Does anyone believe that officers have any special senses or abilities that normal citizens like yourself or myself might not have? Of our new panel, anybody have any thoughts on that? Ms.

Adams, do you have any thoughts about that? Do you believe they have any special abilities that you or I don't have?

A No.

Q

2.0

- I would suggest that perhaps maybe if there was some training on certain areas they may have some special abilities in that area. You mention that you were a paraprofessional and received training for dealing with certain people dealing with special ed needs so you would have the experience. So I would -- I would suggest even for that matter there may be certain matters areas that they may have more experience in than you or myself. But special abilities sight, hearing, things of that nature, would it be fair to say that they may have it just like the rest of us, Ms. Adams?
- A Would they be -- you saying they have the same --
- Q Similar to you or I. Obviously, if they have better eyesight they do; but normal people.
- A In some cases, could be.

Q Okay.

- A All depends on the individual all on different
 levels. They score different. They have different
 learning ability where one might be higher than the
 other one on common sense. Some don't have that.

 Some don't have motor skills.
 - Q You're talking about the people you work with.
 - A Right. So it all depends.
 - Q But if it was an officer or some other person that may testify in the police capacity, do you believe they have special abilities that may be different than you or I?
 - A No. I would -- well, they would both be professionals so that would weigh a little bit more.
 - Q Okay. But within certain ranges.
 - A In certain ranges. You are to consider who's testifying and if they're supposed to be telling the truth so.
 - Q Okay. Thank you. Mr. Beer, how about you? What do you think about that?
 - A They're senses are the same as ours in the normal world. Granted, like you said, if they've had special training in areas, absolutely they should be better.

- Q But I will assume that you will listen to that in order to be able to formulate that decision. You won't give them that special preference until they show you that.
- 5 A No.

2

3

4

6

9

10

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q How about you, Mr. Dickey, what do you think?
- 7 A The training they have with their senses is the 8 same.
 - Q Okay. But you would look at training like Mr.

 Beers said as well too of certain areas.
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q Ms. Combs, how about you?
- 13 A I believe that I can, you know, they're just men.

 14 They're just people. Although they have some

 15 expertise, I don't believe I'd believe them more

 16 than anyone else.
 - Q Right. You would want to -- as we talked a little bit about before if you had some special training --
 - A Yes, I mean, you know, like, he was, like a DNA officer or something, you know, like coroner or something, but as far as just a lay cop.
 - Q Like if he went to special CSI school or something really be a good forensic guy or something.
- 25 A Yes.

- Q So there would be some avenues that perhaps they could be better at if they had the training.
- 3 A Correct.

2

6

7

8

9

23

24

- 4 Q Much like you or I could if we had the training and knowledge.
 - A Right.
 - Q Mr. Bontrager, how about you?
 - A I think they're people just like us. I believe we're all equal so.
- 10 Q How about you, Ms. Keil?
- 11 A The same.
- 12 Q The same abilities that are perceived, nothing far 13 greater, no super human abilities to perceive?
- 14 A No. But they would have more training on what to
 15 look for than we ordinary people would. We just
 16 have to listen the facts.
- Q Okay. Thank you. Mr. Bowser, how about you?
- 18 A I think that a police officer would see a lot more
 19 than I would see if they came onto a crime scene.
 20 I mean, they're trained to do that. I certainly
- 21 hope. As far as their natural abilities, no, I
 22 think they would be average.
 - Q So only what they have been taught to learn would they have picked up any special skill but hearing or eyesight or -- or breaking something down maybe

- common sense wise too they share like the rest of
 us. Is that fair to say?

 A Yes.

 Q But they would pick some things up with seminars
 - and other classes they might have gone to.
 - A I think the perception of something would be totally different than mine would be.
 - Q Because of training?
 - A Because of their training, yes.
 - Q Okay. But in order for them to make that jump or make that conclusion, do you want to hear how they got that or had that ability to learn how to do that?
 - A I didn't understand your question.
 - Q If you say that someone's perception or abilities based on their training is superior to ours, they might have that ability more so than yourself in perceiving something, would you want to learn how they got to that point?
 - A Would I want to know how they achieved that skill?
- 21 Q Yes.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

24

- A Not necessarily. I would assume it would be their training.
 - Q Okay. We had mentioned this earlier and without asking what you heard, but have any of our new

- panel members heard anything about this particular
 case?
 - A Just seen a blurb in the newspaper.
 - A I did to too. Over the weekend, there was small article, well, not small, but an article.
 - Q Okay. Anything abut that article or anything else that you've seen make it you come in with preconceived notion?
 - A No, no.

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

21

Q I think that's all I have. Thank you for your time.

(Counsel approached the bench.)

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Crawford.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going

to give you a recess at this time. We're going to address a legal issue here in court. You are all

prospective jurors in this case. You are prohibited from

18 discussing this case with anyone prior to the

commencement of the evidentiary portion of the trial. To

20 do so may result in a mistrial. After the presentation

of evidence has begun, jurors may discuss the evidence

22 presented amongst themselves in the jury room during

recesses. All regular jurors and alternates must be

24 present during such discussion. You must reserve

judgement concerning the outcome of the case until jury

deliberations begin.

2.0

You may not discuss the facts of this case with me or with the lawyers or with any of the witnesses.

You may not investigate the case yourselves or attempt to obtain information outside the courtroom. It is highly improper for you to do so. You are also prohibited from reading any newspaper accounts of this case and from listening to or watching any radio or television reports relating to this trial. You are to consider and decide this case only upon the evidence received during the course of the trial here in the courtroom. You'll be in care of the bailiff.

(The jury left the courtroom, and the following proceedings were had.)

THE COURT: All right. The record reflects at this point, all defendants are present, counsel for the parties are present. Mr. Beer has been selected in this round, Ms. Combs has been selected in this round. The defendant has exercised peremptory strikes with respect to Bowser and Dickey. Likewise for the state peremptory challenges Dickey and Bontrager. Court did grant

Ms. Keil the challenge for cause. She has a lot on her plate right now. Both sides agreed. She's excused. The state is wanting me to excuse Ms. Adams also. It is my understanding the defendants do not agree. Is that

correct, Mr. Zook? MR. ZOOK: That's correct. THE COURT: And Mr. Crawford. MR. CRAWFORD: Correct, your Honor? THE COURT: All right. Now, Ms. Becker, why should I excuse for cause Ms. Adams. MS. BECKER: On Ms. Adams' questionnaire, she indicated that she has never been a party to a lawsuit

2.0

either a member of her immediate family or herself.

After we received the questionnaires, we, of course, ran

JTS to check on them, which is the county system as far

as the data base of cases, and a JoAnn Adams with many of

the same characteristics came up in eight different -
I've misspoken. It's not ten it's eight different civil

cases: in 2003 a mortgage foreclosure, 2003 three small

claims, 2004 small claim, in '96 another small claim, in

'99 a civil plenary, in '91 a small claim.

I did not want to have her called out in front of the presence of the other jurors as lying on her questionnaire; and therefore, we did not go into that topic while the jury is present. If the Court would entertain that maybe we bring her back in alone and inquire as to why she did not identify this information on her questionnaire, we would think that that would be a proper procedure.

6

7

8

11

12

14

15

16

2.0

21

24

25

THE COURT: Well, that sounds like the right 1 thing to do for to me also, and there's another issue. 3 The record does not reflect that Ms. Adams appears to be an African American individual. The rules do not permit her being excused but for a race neutral reason. Now, Mr. Zook and Mr. Crawford, do you agree if Ms. Becker is right, that's a race neutral reason? She gave false information on her questionnaire. 9 MR. ZOOK: Right. 10 THE COURT: Seems that way to me too? Seem that way to you, Ms. Crawford. MR. CRAWFORD: If she knew it to be false, yes. 13 THE COURT: The record should reflect we're outside that the jury except for Ms. Adams. We're going to ask questions of her. You may be may be seated. Ms. Adams just take any seat here. You don't have to go 17 back all the way to the end of the row. Right there is fine. We're going to ask you some guestions that were 18 not asked at the time you were first here in the 19 courtroom. Mr. Williams. VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION BY MR. WILLIAMS: 22 23 Ms. Adams, do you remember when we started after the lunch break I had asked the question whether

you had ever been a party to a lawsuit?

A Right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- Q Or had ever been involved in a civil or a small claims case? Have you ever been involved in any of those?
 - A Not personally, you mean, like a judgment on me?
 - Not a judgment, but where you would have had like a small claims case where you sued somebody, you had to appear in small claims, or you were sued or you had to actually answer to a small claims case, a mortgage foreclosure?
 - A Yes. Here back, been about 10, 12 years I think.
- Q So it's been a longer period of time.
- 13 A Uh-huh.
 - Q We have the ability to run through our computer system people's names to figure out if they've ever been involved in lawsuits or criminal aspects, and your name came up in eight separate times. A number of times, I think it was six times for small claims cases, one time for mortgage foreclosure, and one time for just a civil lawsuit; and these dates range from 2002, 2001, 1996, 1999, and then all the way back to 1991. Have you ever been involved in more than just the one case involving small claims?
 - A What is the civil law? I don't remember the civil

			177
1		law.	
2	Q	Well, I mean, you can tell me you said you were	
3		involved in at least one of these?	
4	A	The mortgage thing, but it did not go through.	
5		They were saying that we didn't make a payment.	
6		Our payment got lost, and so they was trying to	
7		foreclose, and we did make the payment, and we	
8		showed that we had the money. They just never	
9		pulled out the bank.	
10	Q	Did they file a lawsuit against you to try to get	
11		you to pay?	
12	A	No. Because we had got an attorney. They was	
13		trying to foreclose, but it didn't happen.	
14	Q	You did get an attorney?	
15	A	Yeah. We had an attorney, but it didn't go through	
16		cause, I don't know, we showed proof that we had	
17		the money.	
18	Q	They didn't actually foreclose on your house.	
19	A	No.	
20	Q	But it was a lawsuit actually filed against you	
21		where you had to get an attorney obviously to	
22		answer to what they were saying. Is that correct?	
23	A	To their attorney, yeah.	
24	Q	Did you ever have to appear in court?	
25	A	No.	

- 1 Q Did your attorney ever have to appear in court?
 - A No.

3

4

5

6

7

- Q What about any small claims cases where you're either suing somebody for some amount of money, or you're being sued for some amount of money?
 - A No. I have never been in court for nothing like that.
 - Q And your date of birth is August 9 of 1954?
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 O Your address 58390 Westcot Lane in Goshen?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q And how long have you lived in Elkhart?
- 13 A Twenty-eight years.
- 14 Q So half your life?
- 15 A Uh-huh.
- Q Regardless of whether you had to appear in court for the mortgage foreclosure, did it actually get settled?
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 Q And again with respect to the small claims cases,
 21 has there ever been a time where somebody said that
 22 you owed money and you were told that you owed
 23 money and then you ultimately paid it back before
 24 having to go to court?
- 25 A Might have been.

Q When that might that have been?

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

24

- 2 A I don't remember. I didn't really go to court or anything like that.
 - Q But did you ever get notice in the mail of anything?
 - A I don't remember actually for no claim or anything.

 I don't remember recently.
 - Q Anything dealing with like a credit card or a payment that you had to make on something where you potentially didn't pay and they just wanted to like in the mortgage foreclosure make you pay?
 - A As far as I know, just the mortgage and credit card. They never did try to sue me. I don't remember anything like that.
 - Q When did you say that the mortgage foreclosure was?
- A That's back when we were living 820 Fillhouse. I
 don't remember what we're year that was.
 - Q Could it have been 2002?
- A As far as the mortgage. No. We didn't have mortgage foreclosure not at 2002.
- 21 Q When was it, do you know?
- 22 A It was way back. I don't know what year it was?
- 23 Q Longer than a few years ago.
 - A Right. But not recently, not 2002. My husband might have one on the church maybe, but not on the

```
house.
 1
            What was on the church?
 2
 3
        Α
            Abundant Life.
            But you said there's something on the church?
 4
        Q
            Maybe it been on the church of my husband name.
 5
            But they may have done something civilly.
 6
 7
        Α
            But it was wrong.
            Did you fill out your questionnaire?
 8
        0
            Yes, I did.
 9
        Α
10
        0
            And do you recall checking the box as to whether a
            member of your immediate family or whether you had
11
12
            ever been a party to a lawsuit? Do you remember
13
            checking the boxes to that?
            No. Did I check that?
14
        Α
            Well, you would have actually filled this out it
15
        0
            appears back in November 22, 2004, so it's been a
16
17
            while. You don't remember checking the boxes.
            I remember checking the boxes, but I don't know.
18
            Might have had. I don't know. I did fill it out.
19
20
        Q
            You did fill it out. All right.
                THE COURT: Any other questions.
21
                MR. WILLIAMS: No, other questions.
22
23
                THE COURT: Mr. Zook, any questions?
      ////
24
      1111
25
```

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

2 BY MR. ZOOK:

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

- Q So, Ms. Adams, you and your husband have a church?
- 4 A Right.
 - Q And does he get sued sometimes?
 - A He got -- they tried to sue him for that, for the church.
 - Q Okay. No more questions.

THE COURT: Mr. Crawford any questions.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. CRAWFORD:

- Q Ms. Adams, when the prosecutor asked if you've been a party in a lawsuit before or a party in a suit, what did you think that that meant when he asked you that question?
- A I didn't know he meant like on foreclosure on a house or -- 'cause they just had my husband name on the church. My name is not on that, so that's why I didn't answer. We was trying get it cleared up with our attorney about that with my husband name on it, but my name is not on there, so that's why I didn't answer that.
- Q So when he asked you that question, you didn't believe in your own mind based upon on the question he asked that you were a party in a lawsuit?

```
Right.
 1
        Α
            So to your knowledge, you answered that truthfully
 2
            from what you understood the question to be.
 3
        Α
            Yes.
 4
                MR. CRAWFORD: I have no further questions,
 5
      your Honor.
 6
 7
                THE COURT: Anybody have any other questions?
      Take her back to the jury room for the moment.
 8
                     (Juror left the courtroom.)
 9
10
                THE COURT: What do you have to say, Mr.
      Williams, in a few short words? Yes/no.
11
12
                MR. WILLIAMS: Yes/no cause.
13
                THE COURT: Yes. That's correct.
14
                MR. WILLIAMS: I believe my questions, Judge,
      to the panel were, were you a party or involved in a
15
      lawsuit; and I believe from her answers that she was
16
17
      involved in the mortgage foreclosure. So I would ask
      that it be for cause still; and if not, we'd ask for the
18
19
      peremptory.
2.0
                THE COURT: What is -- defense, what do you
21
      say?
                MR. ZOOK: Judge, I think that she wasn't --
22
23
      she wasn't thinking of the same thing that the prosecutor
24
      was thinking of about being involved in a lawsuit. I
      don't know. I haven't seen what there was on the Court
25
```

dockets.

2.0

2.5

THE COURT: Would you like for Ms. Jackson to print that out?

MR. ZOOK: I -- I think maybe it would be helpful for you. As far as I'm concerned, it appeared to me that she wasn't deliberately trying to mislead anybody.

THE COURT: Well, deliberately being the operative word. Whether she was confused or whether she gave the wrong answer, of course, that is the issue.

Mr. Williams says if I don't grant cause he'll use a peremptory. What do you have to say, Mr. Crawford?

MR. CRAWFORD: I don't think cause is here, your Honor. I think she was confused over the line of questioning. They did mention party, but whether or not she understood exactly what that meant whether it had gone to court or she was in court, maybe that was her understanding of it, and I think on that alone, I don't think that's cause.

THE COURT: All right. Well, we're going to a look, and we're going to see what the record does, in fact, show. I'll let you know when she gets it printed.

(A recess was taken.)

THE COURT: All right. The defendants are present, counsel for the defendants are present, counsel

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

have Mr. Wenzel. Correct?

for the state is present. Court has had the bailiff print chronological case summary. The Court will deliver these chronological case summaries to the court reporter and ask that she make them a part of the record. One cause No. 20E01-9310-FC-4332 appears to be a case where an agreed judgment was entered. JoAnn Adams was one of the defendants sued with Kevin Adams. There are a number of others here present also. It appears that the state's request that Ms. Adams be excused for cause is well taken. The Court will find that cause is granted, and the Court will also note that race neutral reasons have been presented by the state with respect to this issue. It is clear that she gave different information on these collection cases than what the actual record show. For that reason, she'll be excused. Ladies and gentlemen, as you look at your list of jurors Mr. Wenzel, Ms. Risser, Mr. Martin, Mr. Pippenger, and Mr. Lundy will appear in the box when they return. We're going to shorten matters up. 15 minutes per side from this point forward. (The jury entered the courtroom, and the following proceedings were had.) THE COURT: Be seated, please. Mr. Beer and Ms. Combs, welcome to the jury. In seat No. 1 we now

A JUROR: Yes. 1 THE COURT: And in seat No. 4 we Ms. Risser. 2 3 A JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: In seat No. 7 Mr. Martin. 4 A JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: In seat No. 8 Mr. Pippenger. 6 7 A JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: And in seat No. 9, Mr. Lundy. 8 A JUROR: Yes, sir. 9 10 THE COURT: Ms. Becker. VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 11 12 BY MS. BECKER: 13 Thank you, Judge. Good afternoon. Ms. Risser, 14 you're the only female on this panel, so not that that means anything -- excuse me for just a second. 15 The nice thing is that now that we're down to five 16 individuals this is going to start going a lot 17 faster. Plus, I trust that you've been able to 18 hear most of everything that the attorneys have 19 2.0 been asking. Is that accurate for our five new individuals? 21 22 (The jurors indicated.) 23 Yes. Okay. Great. So things will move a lot 24 faster. So let's first of all about these legal 25 concepts that are going to be present in this case;

namely, felony murder and accessory liability. Mr. 1 Martin, why don't you tell me if you remember what 2 3 felony murder is? Felony murder to me would mean somebody to commit a 4 Α felony such as robbery or a burglary in which a 5 murder happens as a result of that. 6 7 Okay. Or in the process of that? Q In the process of. Α 8 9 Okay. Mr. Pippenger, that make sense to you? Q 10 Α Makes sense. Makes sense. Do you think it's fair? 11 0 12 Α Yes. 13 Q For all five of you same question. Do you all you 14 think that this law is fair? Yes. 15 Α 16 That even though you don't mean to commit the Q 17 murder, it still happens? 18 Α Yes. Now, Mr. Lundy, do you remember what accessory 19 Q 20 liability is or aiding and inducing? Yes. Someone who is driving a car get away or who 21 Α plots it but doesn't actually commit the murder. 22 23 Α Yes. 24 0 Do you think that's fair that we still hold

somebody accountable for the ultimate crime?

- 1 A Yes, I do.
- 2 Q All right. What about you, Mr. Pippenger?
- 3 A Yes.
- 4 Q Mr. Martin?
- 5 A Yes.
- 6 Q Ms. Risser.
- 7 A Yes.
- 8 O Mr. Wenzel?
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q Okay. All right. Anybody have any trouble with
 11 enforcing those two laws?
- 12 (The juror indicated.)
- Q No. All right. Great. Move on then. I want to
- talk to each one of you individually about your
- upbringing, your moral principles, your beliefs. I
- characterize it as strong feelings with the
- individuals I spoke to the first round. Mr.
- 18 Wenzel, let's start with you. Can you think of
- anything just the things that make you who you are
- and after hearing what you've heard about this case
- and the types of evidence that we expect, the types
- of things that you're going to be observing, do you
- think there's anything about your background, your
- 24 beliefs, that might effect your ability to be fair
- 25 and impartial in this case?

- 1 A No.
- 2 Q No problem?
- 3 A No.
- Q Do you have any questions or any hesitations so far?
 - A No.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- 7 Q All right. Any questions of me?
- 8 A No.
 - Q Mrs. Risser, same question. Anything about what you've heard so far that maybe kind of giving you knee jerk reaction or think, oh, boy, I hope I did don't get up there so I don't have to deal with this.
 - A Well, I come in kind of nervous right now; but, no,
 I think I can be fair.
 - Q Okay. Believe me everybody is nervous, even me.

 All of us are. You know, this is not someplace

 where you should feel comfortable. I mean, it's a

 different environment than what you're used to so

 expect that. Have you noticed though that some

 people deal with nervousness differently. For

 example, if I picked you out right now and rather

 than having you sit next to everybody and put you

 on that chair up there and started asking you all

 these personal questions, would you be maybe more

189 nervous? 1 2 Α Yes. 3 Q All right. Somebody asked earlier about perceiving witnesses and credibility of witnesses. Do you 4 think that you have a good ability to perceive 5 credibility of witnesses? 6 7 I think probably. Α All right. Will you keep an open mind and consider 0 8 maybe their ability to perceive things as well as 9 10 their nervousness when they're testifying too? 11 Α Yes. 12 And, of course, police officers, the coroner, the 13 forensic pathologist, they're professional 14 witnesses, a little bit different situation; but obviously these are the things that you're going to 15 16 have to keep in your mind is that filter. Does 17 that make sense to you? 18 Yes. Α Do you think you're going to be able to do that? 19 Q 20 Α I think so. All right. So, Mr. Lundy, same question. If 21 0 somebody looks a little bit nervous or maybe won't 22 23 make eye contact with you all the time, will you 24 keep an open mind before flat out thinking they're 25 just lying to you?

- 1 A Yeah, I'll keep an open mind.
- Q Keep an open mind. Sometimes it can be hard though, can't it?
- 4 A Very hard.

9

10

11

- Q Very hard. All right. What kinds of experiences
 have you had having to judge credibility of
 individuals you don't know?
 - A I used to be landlord. I had a bunch of rental properties so we run across all kinds of people.
 - Q All kinds of people. And did you ever have to resolve disputes; for example, the check is in the mail that kind of thing?
- 13 A And shotguns, hand grenades.
- 14 Q Hand grenades?
- 15 A Oh, yes.
- 16 Q Well, that's an interesting one.
- 17 A Meth lab.
- 18 Q Meth lab. That seems to be more common anymore.
- 19 A Yes, it is.
- Q Okay. Do you think that you are a person who has
 enough common sense that you can kind of sort
 through the BS and the regular information?
- 23 A Very much.
- Q Do you think you're the kind of person that can appreciate perceptions that may be different than

your own? 1 2 Yes, to a point. 3 Q To a point. Okay. Do you understand what I'm askinq? 4 5 Α Kind of. Okay. You heard during that minnie opening that 6 7 thumbnail sketch that some of the people that may be witnesses in this case may not possess the same 8 mental faculties that everybody else does. Can you 9 10 keep that in mind, or are you more of the type of person that you hold everybody to the same 11 12 standard? 13 Α I hold a lot of people to the same standard, but 14there are exceptions to every rule. Okay. Fair enough. Anything abut your upbringing, 15 your moral principles, just your character, you as 16 17 a person that you think might nibble at you and keep you from being completely fair and impartial 18 in this case? 19 20 Oh, yeah. I feel that if someone takes a life they Α should take theirs. 21 22 MR. ZOOK: I couldn't hear the juror. 23 Could you repeat that? Q 24 Α I said I believe if someone takes a life they

25

forfeit theirs.

Q That -- probably most people in here may share that with you. It talks about more consequences though. What does it take, though, for you to -- well, let me just put it this way. The standard in the State of Indiana is beyond a reasonable doubt. In other words, the State of Indiana must prove to you that we got the right people.

Obviously, you probably want to be sure you got the right people before that principle would apply. Do you believe that on that, because that's what your job is, do we have the right people, and how this occurred. Do you believe that you can be fair and impartial for that part?

- A I'm kind of like straddling the fence right now on that one.
- Q Okay. I'll come back to you in a couple minutes then. Think about that long and hard because we got to have a clean plate. It's just -- you know what it is.
- A I understand.
- Q Mr. Pippenger, real quick, anything about your upbringing, your personal belief, the things you that you've observed here in this courtroom so far that you think might nibble at you and maybe --
- 25 A No.

- Q You're fine?
- 2 A Yes, ma'am.
- Q Mr. Martin, what about you?
- 4 A Me, I'm fine.
- 5 Q You're fine. All right. Any questions so far
- 6 Mr. Martin?
- 7 A No.

- 8 Q Anything that you've observed so far that gives you
 9 any hesitations about you ability to serve as a
 10 juror?
- 11 A No.
- 12 Q No. Mr. Pippenger?
- 13 A No, ma'am.
- Q No problem. Okay. One thing that had not been
 gone over yet, the differences between inferences
 and speculation. Mr. Martin, can you give me your
 words as to the difference between an inference and
 a speculation?
- 19 A I couldn't tell you the difference.
- Q Okay. Anybody want to volunteer? I won't be hard on you. I promise. Mr. Pippenger, you want to volunteer?
- 23 A No.
- Q All right. I'll help you out. When we talk about
 this concept of beyond a reasonable doubt, first of

all, how many of you five have heard of this before?

(The jurors indicated.)

2.0

- Q Okay. Everybody has heard of beyond a reasonable doubt, and you've heard people talk about the fact that it's not beyond all doubt because there's always some gray area. Do you all agree with that?

 (The jurors answered in the affirmative.)
- Q Okay. You're fine with that. Some people have issues about, well, what is reasonable doubt. And while we can tell you what it says, you know, as far as the courts have given definitions of it, more often than not, we just confusion you more than we actually educate you.

Reasonable doubt is not something that can be based on speculation. In other words, I think it was the lady that sat in your seat, Mr. Lundy, talked about the what ifs. What ifs are speculation. There has to be evidence. In other words, something you can wrap your hands around, something you can wrap your hands around that causes doubt. Okay. Does that make sense? All right. You can't speculate or think, well, what if it is was this, or what if it was that. That is

- impermissible in a court of law. Why do you think that is? Mr. Lundy.
- A There's to many gray areas.

- Q Too many what ifs. Too many what ifs. And if there is evidence of something out there, then you're going to see it. Does that make sense?

 Mrs. Risser, what do you think?
- A Yeah. I think that makes sense.
- Q Okay. So you may not, you may not speculate about all these what ifs out here unless there's some evidence, something you can put your hands on explaining that.

Now, an inference on the other hand, is a common sense deduction that you make from seeing certain facts. In other words, I walk in this room, you hear some boom boom outside, and I have an umbrella in one hand, but I'm still soaking wet. What's the inference you can make, Mr. Wenzel?

- A Thunder and lightening. It's raining.
- Q Thunder, lightening. It's raining outside. That's an inference. You've not been outside to experience it. The cherry pie, you know, or chocolate cake on child's face when you don't see him eating it. All these things have been talked about previously, but that's the difference between

```
1
            speculation and inference. How many of you feel
 2
            confident that you can keep those things separate?
            All five of you. Everybody is saying yes.
 3
            Everyone understand the difference between
 4
            speculation and inference?
 5
            Yes.
 6
        Α
 7
            Any questions?
        Q
        Α
            No.
 8
            Okay. Very good. Do all of you feel like this
 9
        Q
10
            concept of beyond a reasonable doubt you think you
            can handle it? You think you're going to know it
11
12
            when you see Mr. Wenzel?
13
        Α
            Yes.
14
        Q
            Ms. Risser?
15
            Yes.
        Α
            Mr. Lundy?
16
        Q
17
        Α
            Yes.
            Mrs. Pippenger?
18
        Q
19
        Α
            Yes.
20
        Q
            Mr. Miller?
21
        Α
            Yes.
            How many of you have ever been in this position
22
23
            before actually called to the box or serve as a
24
            juror? Anybody? No. Okay. Last thing I want to
            ask you about are any -- we've called them
25
```

sympathies. I refer to it as special knowledge or knowledge that maybe somebody else, your neighbor may not have about a mental disabilities or mental issues, crime scene CSI type stuff, forensic evidence, the rules of evidence, anything like that.

Do any of you have any special knowledge about any of the topics that we have talked about so far or that have come up so far based upon either your own personal experience, something you've read in the newspaper, something you've read a journal on, or even have received formal training on? Anybody in any of those situations?

(The jurors answered in the negative.)

- Q Okay. Do any of you feel like you are persons whose sympathies or emotions might nibble at you a little too much in this case to the extent that it may make you a little less fair than you should be?

 Anything have any hesitations on that? Ms. Risser, maybe?
- A Maybe, I'm not sure.
- Q All right. I'll come back to you on that too.

 Don't let me forget you guys. Mr. Pippenger?
- A No.

2.0

Q No problem. Mr. Martin?

- 1 A No.
- 2 Q Mr. Wenzel?
- 3 A No.

- Q Mr. Wenzel, you're young compared to everybody else on this panel, and it could come down to a situation where you're back in that jury room and literally everybody is screaming at you. How do you think that's going to effect you?
 - A I really don't know.
 - Q It has been my experience that sometimes individuals who have not had as much life experience tend to not quite understand the gravity of what this is all about. Do you think you're one of those persons, or do you think you're well qualified for this job?
- A Well qualified.
- 17 Q Why?
 - A Because I'm an optimist, and I'll get all the evidence, and nobody else can sway me.
 - Q Okay. Now, if you guys are having logical discussions back there and you're still number one and they're 11 eleven against you but yet you feel very confident in why you feel the way you do, will you continue to engage in discussions until either the 11 change their mind or you change your mind?

- 1 A Yes.
- Q Okay. Has to be a unanimous verdict. Okay. Does that make sense?
- 4 A Yes.
- 5 Q Any hesitations whatsoever?

person for this jury?

6 A No.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- Q Okay. Let's come back to you two then. Mr. Lundy, really the bottom line question is: Are you a person that we want on this jury? Because while you may be great on any other jury, the question is here we are here for this case and we've got to have a clean plate fair and impartial all the way across. Do you think someone with your current state of mind, the experiences that you've had, and the things that you believe, that you are a good
- 17 A No.
- 18 Q No. Why not?
- 19 A Cause at an early age, I took care of some elderly 20 people.
- Q All right. Do you have special sympathies then for that?
- 23 A Yes, I do.
- Q All right. Thank you very much for your honesty.
- I appreciate that. Ms. Risser, you indicated that

you're a little concerned about you sympathies as 1 well. Can you articulate that for me? 2 3 Α Well, I don't know that I really know anybody that has some special needs, but I know when I see 4 people in that situation I kind of feel for them. 5 Okay. To the extent that maybe you don't hold them 6 7 as responsible for what they do? No, I don't think so. Α 8 9 Q You don't think that. Okay. Do you have any 10 concerns that these feelings that you're experiencing or that you have as part of you might 11 12 effect your ability to be fair and impartial when 13 you're trying to decide whether the defendants did 14 what we accused them of doing? No, I think I could still be fair. 15 Α 16 Q Could still be fair on that. Do you want to be a 17 juror in this case? 18 Not really. Α Why not? That's okay. I'm glad you said that. 19 Q 2.0 Why not? I have other things going on in my life this week, 21 Α and I don't know. I just don't feel like I want to 22 23 be. 24 0 That's okay. You know, quite frankly, the things

that we don't want to do are sometime the things we

```
do best. In other situations, they're not. What
 1
            I'm trying to do is figure out if this is something
 2
            where it may not be the best thing or the
 3
            otherwise, and I'm not quite sure where we're on
 4
            that. Do you have any questions of me?
 5
            I don't think so.
 6
        Α
 7
            All right. Last chance for all of you five. Does
        Q
            anyone have any questions of me, anything I haven't
 8
            asked you that I should have asked you to get to
 9
            know you a little bit before we make this decision?
10
11
        Α
            No.
12
        Α
            No.
13
        Α
            No.
14
        Α
            No.
            I do have a question. I'm not sure. It was
15
        Α
16
            brought up by one of other attorneys about photos
            that may be very graphic, and I have a very queasy
17
            stomach. I get physically ill, and I even
18
            sometimes pass out.
19
20
            With the Court's permission, should I explain
        Q
            the -- I mean -- how -- what they may be that way
21
            they may know what to expect?
22
23
                     (An off-the-record discussion was held
24
                     at the bench.)
25
                THE COURT: Any other question, Ms. Becker?
```

```
MS. BECKER: No, your Honor. Thank you.
 1
      you, ladies and gentlemen.
 2
 3
                THE COURT: Mr. Zook.
                MR. ZOOK: Thank you, Judge.
 4
                        VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
 5
      BY MR. ZOOK:
 6
            Moving right along. We're trying. Now, Mr.
 7
        Q
            Wenzel, age 26?
 8
            Actually, 27. My birthday is today.
 9
        Α
10
        Q
            Today?
11
        Α
            Yes.
12
        Q
            Congratulations. You'll remember your 27th
13
            birthday. Okay. You still have your life ahead of
            you. What do you want to do?
14
           Be a dentist.
15
        Α
            Okay. You have a school picked out?
16
        Q
17
        Α
            Yeah.
                  Where are you going?
18
        Q
            Okay.
            IUSB.
19
        Α
20
        Q
            Good for you. And, Mr. Pippenger, you're second to
21
            youngest, and you tie with the guy next to you. No
            birthdays there. Right?
22
23
            My wife's is tomorrow.
        Α
24
        0
            Well, maybe she'll be happy if you're here then.
25
        Α
            She might be.
```

- Q Mr. Pippenger, I see you're a computer programmer at First Source Bank. How long have you done that?
 - A Going on six years.
- Q Okay. What would you do other than a computer programmer if you had your choice?
 - A Golf course management.
 - Q Okay. And let's see here, Mr. Martin.
- 8 A Yes, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

- 9 Q How about yourself? I see you work at Kreuter what do you do there?
- 11 A I'm the marketing manager. I have been for about seven years.
- Q Well, that's back to about 23, age 23?
- 14 A Yes, sir.
- Q What would you do if you could be trained and do anything at all?
- 17 A I really enjoy my job at my current capacity.
 - Q All right. Okay. Now, you understand that with respect to reasonable doubt -- the prosecutor talked about that a little bit, but what we're really looking for and your job in examining the evidence is to see if there is a reasonable doubt as to guilt so you're looking for a hole in the state's evidence. It might not be anything
- tangible because it's a just a hole. You think you

can do that? 1 2 Α Absolutely. 3 Q We might have -- you might be said to be speculating if you're wondering about whether 4 5 somebody came down on a flying saucer and did the crime, but I expect that the prosecutor and the 6 7 defense counsel may have a bit of an argument in front of you later in the case concerning what is 8 speculation and what is inference. And there are 9 10 some gray areas there too, aren't there? You understand what we're talking about here? 11 12 Yes. Α 13 Q Okay. Now, do any of you have any questions about 14 the right of a person not to take a witness stand in a case that's against that person? 15 16 Α Yes. 17 Do you? 18

Α Yeah.

20

21

22

23

24

- Tell me about that? 19 Q
 - Α Well, for example, if they got up there, and they're really nervous, it might blow the case open because a juror might think that they're guilty because --
 - Okay. You agree then that it's okay for a person not to take the witness stand?

1 Α Yes. And you wouldn't hold it against that person? 2 Q 3 Α Yes. We in accord back here? 4 Q 5 (The jurors indicated in the affirmative.) 6 7 How do you feel about a policeman being a witness, Q Mr. Wenzel? 8 9 A Ask the question again. 10 0 How did you expect a policeman's testimony would be in comparison to that of a lay person? 11 12 Hopefully, they would be telling the truth. It's Α 13 their job, and --14 Q So you're not hoping that for a lay person. A lay person. 15 Α 16 Q A person who's not a policeman. I'm not really --I'm not really speaking -- I quess a pastor could 17 be lay person. 18 19 Α Yes. 20 Q How -- how do you think -- do you think the policemen or more likely to tell the truth than 21 other people? 22 23 I would hope so. Α 24 0 See, we're here to judge whether the case that the police put together is a good one. Can you be a 25

good check in that kind of case? 1 I think so. 2 Α Okay. And you'll make it be proven and not just 3 Q trust people in general? 4 5 Α Yes. Okay. And how about Mr. Pippenger? 6 7 You know, I would expect them to maybe handle the Α situation a little bit better than, say, a 8 defendant would who's not been on trial before, but 9 10 that's just from experience rather than --Okay. Mr. Martin, how would you expect a policeman 11 Q 12 to behave on the witness stand? 13 Α The same as witness would as any other lay witness. 14 Q Okay. Can you judge the police action and the action of the prosecution in this case just like 15 16 you would anyone else? 17 Α Absolutely. Okay. I guess I'm trying to get to bias. Do any 18 Q of the three of you feel that there is little bit 19 2.0 of a problem since we are here in court and there's a case against my client and Mr. Crawford's client, 21 do any of you feel that that means that they're 22 23 probably guilty? 24 (The jurors indicated in the 25 negative.)

No. You might be thinking about this for the first 1 time. Have any of the three of you thought in the 2 past that one of you could be arrested and not have 3 done anything wrong? 4 (The jurors indicated in the 5 affirmative.) 6 7 Okay. Thank you. Any questions of me? Q (The juror indicated in the negative.) 8 Who knows each other now? At least you don't know 9 Q 10 each other. Right? Okay. Pass. THE COURT: Mr. Crawford. 11 12 MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you, your Honor. 13 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 14 BY MR. CRAWFORD: Just have a few questions of our new panel. Have 15 any of you served on a jury before of our new 16 17 panel. (The jurors answered in the negative.) 18 Has anybody of our new panel been the victim of a 19 Q 2.0 crime or had a family member that was a victim of a crime? 21 A friend. 22 23 What kind of situation was that, Mr. Wenzel? 24 Α He was stabbed with a beer bottle in the neck. 25 0 When was that?

- A I think this last Christmas.
 - Q And where did that happen?
 - A In Mishawaka/South Bend.
 - Q What happened with the case?
- A I'm not really sure.
 - Q Were you present when it happened, or you just heard about it?
- A No. I heard about it.
 - Q Anything because of that, the nature of that situation of being a violent crime and all, that would make it difficult for you to consider the facts of this case?
- 13 A No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- Q Any of our panel members have anything going on at home or work, our new panel members, that would make it hard for you to focus on the evidence the next couple of days?
- A I have golf outing on Friday.
 - Q Are you going to be thinking about that over the next three or four days? Will this impact your ability to practice before the golf outing or -- okay. Just want make sure. We could arrange for some the range balls perhaps. Okay. I'll give it a rest. So, obviously, that's the only thing going on that with would be an issue if we were to get

into Friday necessarily.

2.0

- A That wouldn't be an issue.
- Q I hope we're not going that far. Anyone else have any things going on at home or family members that would make it difficult to be here the next couple of days.

(The juror indicated in the negative.)

Did our new panel members understand when I believe the three or four of us spoke about the presumption of innocence? Any problem with that concept that as Mr. Royer sits here today and Ms. Canen sits her today they're presumed innocent, and the burden of proof rests solely on the State of Indiana, but the presumption of the innocence is something that stays with a person throughout the course of the trial. It's up to the state to whether they attack that particular thing. Any problem with that?

So if you were to hear -- get a question right now, how would you vote? Not guilty probably.

Right? You haven't heard anything. So no problem with keeping that protection in mind as you listen the evidence of our new panel members?

(The juror indicated in the negative.)

Q Mr. Wenzel, how do you make a major decision in your life?

- You weigh the pros and a cons. Α
- Base upon that then you make a decision? Q
- 3 Α Based upon where your goals, where you want to go.
 - Okay. Mr. Martin, how about you? Q
 - In my job, I'm in charge of a lot of product development type stuff for our products, and asking questions, listening to all sides. You don't just listen to one person. You listen to everyone, gather the information, and determine what you believe is credible.
 - So it's a process? Q
- 12 Absolutely. Α

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

20

21

22

23

- Q How about you, Mr. Pippenger?
- 14 I think the first thing I would do is consult with my wife and see what her opinion is on it. Then depending on how big of a decision it is, probably 17 consult other people and weigh out the pros and cons and decide from there. 18
- So it's kind of a fact gathering process. 19 Q
 - Absolutely. Α
 - Has any of our new panel ever been involved in a 0 lawsuit where they've brought the action or they've been a part of it whether that be criminal or civil or been witness in the case?
- 25 (The juror indicated in the negative.)

0 Any of our new panel have any friends or associates 1 or family members who might be police officers? 2 I do. My ex-girlfriend, her dad was the assistant 3 Α chief; and her sister's husband works in Indy as a 4 cop. 5 Okay. Because you have that special affiliation or 6 7 you previously had it, would that in any way impact your ability to fairly listen to what you hear 8 presented in the witness chairs over the next 9 10 couple of days? 11 No. 12 I know Mr. Zook explored a little bit with you 13 about whether or not you would believe an officer 14 over and above any other witnesses. Would that come into play into your -- that way you would 15 16 value the testimony of officers? 17 Α No. I think that's all I have. Thank you all. (Counsel approached the bench.) 18 THE COURT: Mr. Wenzel, Mr. Risser, Ms. Lundy, 19 20 you'll be excused. Mr. Pippenger, Mr. Martin, welcome to the jury. 21 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 22 23 BY MR. WILLIAMS: 24 Good afternoon, Mr. Myers, Ms. Truex, and 25 Mrs. Mark. The -- one of first -- we'll start with

- Ms. Truex, do you know who I am? 1 You know, I didn't when I first walked in, but I do 2 3 now. You work at South Bend Medical Foundation? 4 5 Yeah. I work at Elkhart Hospital for South Bend Medical in the lab. 6 7 And I believe you've either been a witness or are a Q witness in one of my cases? 8 You -- you -- it was settled out of court, but I 9 Α 10 did interview with you as a witness -- possible 11 witness. 12 Is anything about me talking to you and you being a 13 witness in that case that you think is going to 14 effect your ability to sit on this panel and listen to the evidence that's presented on the fact that 15 16 you know who I am? 17 Α No, I don't believe so. Do you -- you work for South Bend Medical 18 Q
- Foundation. Is that right? 19
- 20 Α That's correct.
- But you work at Elkhart General Hospital. 21 Q
- 22 Α Yes.
- 23 Do you know Dr. Joseph Prahlow?
- No. I know of him. I know the coroner. I mean, I 24 Α 25 see the coroner on a regular basis. He brings

- samples in because the coroner -- the morgue is
 right down the hall from the lab.

 Q So Dr. Prahlow works in -A -- in South Bend.
 - Q And you said the coroner. Who is that?
 - A Dr. Jeffrey Landrum.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

- Q So you know Dr. Landrum and Dr. Prahlow?
 - A I know of Dr. Prahlow. I've not even met him. We have pathologists that come to Elkhart, but I've not had the pleasure of meeting him.
 - Q That fact that he works for South Bend Medical

 Foundation do you think that would have any impact

 on your ability to be fair and impartial in this

 case?
- 15 A I don't believe so.
 - Q What about the fact that you know Dr. Landrum? Any belief that that would have any effect on your ability to listen to the evidence and render a decision?
 - A Not at all.
- Q Mr. Myers, it said in your questionnaire that you're self-employed.
- 23 A Yes.
- Q What do you do?
- 25 A I own a fence company.

Q Is that here in Elkhart.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

23

24

- A It's in Elkhart County, yes.
 - Q Listening to all the questions that you've heard over the past several hours, is there anything that comes to mind as you sit there that you wanted to talk about?
 - A What I could hear, not really.
 - Q Were there things that you couldn't hear?
 - A Yeah. You couldn't hear everything that what said back there; but from what I heard, I have no real questions about.
 - Q Same question for you, Mrs. Mark. Anything that -what you've heard that's come up you said I really need to talk about that when I get up there?
- A No.
 - Q No. We've talked about the concepts of felony murder and accomplice liability. Did you hear us discuss those?
- A Yes.
- Q With regard to felony murder, can you tell me what
 in your mind that is, Mr. Martin -- I'm sorry. Mr.
 Myers?
 - A From what I understand, it's in the commission of a felony crime there's a murder where accidentally or there was a murder involved.

- Q And does anybody else have any differing opinion or thought about that concept of felony murder? Ms.

 Truex.
- A I pretty much agree with that.
- 5 Q Mrs. Mark.
- 6 A I agree.

2

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

- Q You agree. Okay. Accomplice liability, Mrs. Mark, what does that -- what does that mean to you when you hear that?
- A Well, anybody that was involved in the crime is held as responsible as the person who actually pulled the trigger or whatever.
- Q Do you believe that's fair?
- 14 A Yes.
- Q And do you understand that -- that concept?
- 16 A Yes.
- 17 Q Ms. Truex, do you think that's fair?
- 18 A I do. I believe anyone involved should be held
 19 accountable.
- 20 Q How about you, Mr. Myers?
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 Q Any strong feelings moral, religious anything in
 23 your upbringing, personal beliefs, that stands out
 24 that you think would make you a particularly good
- juror or possibly, and we'll use the term poor

juror, Mr. Truex? 1 I make -- I think I would be a good juror. I have 2 Α 3 to make decisions every night at work. What types of decisions? 4 Q I'm the assistant supervisor on second shift. 5 if there's an incident problem or there's a problem 6 7 with a patient or something like that, I think I could be fair minded and keep it open. 8 You're job at the hospital, are things always black 9 Q 10 and white in your work? Not at all. Medicine is not? 11 12 Q Go ahead. 13 Α I'm sorry. No it's not black and white. 14Q Did you say medicine is not an exact science? Right. That's what I was going to say. 15 Α 16 So you have to make judgment decisions and evaluate Q 17 what's going on in your job to come up with certain decisions. 18 19 Based on my experiences and, yes. Α 20 Mr. Myers, anything that particularly in your Q upbringing or beliefs that you think would be --21 make you a particularly good juror or -- or -- or 22 23 not? 24 Α The fact that I deal with people everyday. I have 25 for 28 years. All kinds of people, all ethnic

- backgrounds. So I form my opinions pretty muchbased on my experiences.
 - Q And do you sell fences?
- 4 A Yes, I do.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

22

23

24

- Q So you have to make evaluations about the people that come into your business if they're paying or whatever.
- A That's right.
 - Q Mrs. Mark, what about you?
 - A I think I would be very bad juror because one, I tend to believe what people tell me; and two, I probably would be the juror that held out on some technicality, you know, that everybody agreed. But I would be the one that, you know, found something wrong and couldn't --
 - Q Couldn't put it to rest.
- 17 A Yeah.
- Q Well, that kind of brings up the concept of beyond
 a reasonable doubt that we talked about. In your
 mind, what do you think beyond a reasonable doubt
 is?
 - A Well, it's been stated before. I think that there's always going to be some doubt; but if it can be proved that -- oh, I don't know how to say it -- that reasonably the fact (inaudible) then

that's the way it is. Does that make sense? 1 Okay. When you -- do you think that -- that to 2 3 hold somebody accountable and if you had to render a verdict in this case and it has to be unanimous 4 5 and to make your decision, would the state have to prove the defendant's guilt beyond all doubt in 6 7 your mind? Α No. 8 But there's someone that you -- in your upbringing 9 Q 10 or whatever that you look to the benefit of everybody or that you look and see -- try to find 11 12 the thing that might trip you up? 13 Α Right. 14 All right. Well, that's an honest answer. Has anybody had any experience with persons who have --15 that aren't -- I don't know what the word would be. 16 17 There's different ones. I quess the mental sophistication or have some mental deficiencies not 18 that rise to the level of insanity or that 19 2.0 they're -- that they're necessarily hospitalized? My mother is suffering from dementia right now. 21 Α I'm her careqiver. 22 23 All right. And is she on medication for that? 24 Α Not at the moment, but she's being evaluated. 25 Q I mean, is there really anything that they'll be

- able to do as far as treating that?

 A That's a good question.
 - A That's a good question.

- Q It's up in the air. Is there anything about that -- is that the only contact that you've had with somebody?
- A Well, I see people in my line of work too.
- Q And specifically is your line of work?
 - A I work in the lab. Now, the phlebotomist may have more contact, but I see all kind of people they bring in for drug testing for instance and stuff so --
 - Anything about dealing with this dementia that your mother may or may not have or she's being diagnosed that you think would effect your ability to -- to be fair and impartial in this case?
- A No.
 - Q Do you think that a person that -- that isn't maybe as smart as some other people should be held accountable for their actions?
 - A Based on -- I'm not quite sure what you're getting at.
 - Q Well, it doesn't rise, let's say, to the level of a mental illness. But somebody just isn't as smart as another person or might be slow or might have some mental deficiencies. Do you think they should

be held accountable for what their actions are? 1 I don't believe no more than anyone else. 2 Α 3 Q So everybody should be treated equal. That doesn't give them a free pass. 4 That's right. 5 Α Does anybody here have any what they believe would 6 7 be special knowledge with regard to law enforcement, have any family members that are 8 involved in law enforcement, or have been 9 10 themselves involved in law enforcement. Mrs. Mark? I have a lot of members of my family that are 11 Α 12 attorneys, a judge, police officers. 13 Q And are those local? 14 Α A couple of local, yes. So having -- and you said family members, how 15 0 16 close? Sister, brother, uncle cousin. 17 Α And having that in your background with hearing, 18 Q I'm sure, them talk about their job potentially, is 19 20 there anything about that, that you think would have any effect on you in sitting as a juror? 21 22 Α No. 23 Ms. Truex, anybody law enforcement? 24 Α Not that I'm aware. 25 Q Mr. Myers?

- 1 A No.
- 2 Q Has anybody served on a jury before? New panel.
- No. Mr. Myers, what do you like to do in your free
- 4 time?

21

22

23

- 5 A As little as possible.
 - Q Okay. All right.
- 7 A I play a little golf. That's about all I have time 8 for.
- 9 Q So being self-employed you don't have a lot of time.
- 11 A No.
- 12 Q The fact you're self-employed and this is going to
 13 be a trial that you're going to have to -- if
 14 you're selected be here at least through Wednesday,
 15 is that going to be hardship on you not being at
 16 the business?
- 17 A No, I'll make do.
- 18 Q Do you have other employees that can help out?
- A Not really, but my situation is such that I can -
 I can handle it.
 - Q Okay. All right. There's not going to be anything out there that you're going to be worried about that you won't be able to give 100 percent of your attention over here?
- 25 A Not particularly, no.

Ms. Truex, anything that you think is out in the 1 outside world that you're dealing with right now 2 that will effect you to be able to give 100 percent 3 of your attention? 4 Well, my mother's condition probably, but I have 5 caretakers arranged for her for the next couple 6 7 days. And going through Wednesday? 8 0 That should not be a problem. 9 Α 10 Q Anything you like to do in your free time? I like, what free time I have, is I like sports and 11 Α 12 reading. 13 Q Okay. 14 MR. WILLIAMS: I have no other questions, 15 Judge? 16 THE COURT: Mr. Zook. 17 MR. ZOOK: Thank you, Judge. VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 18 BY MR. ZOOK: 19 20 We get a little bit shorter each time, and now you 21 folks are in the hot seats. Mr. Myers, you've never been on a jury before? 22 23 No, I haven't. Α 24 Have you ever been called? 25 Α No.

- I see that your wife used to work for the Disabled American Veterans. What did she do?
- Α She's a bartender.
- Is that here in Goshen, or where was that?
- Α Yes. 5

2

3

4

11

16

17

- So she's out of a job. 6
- 7 She works for me now. Α
- Ms. Truex, you said you're down the hall from the 0 8 9 coroner.
- 10 Α Yes, well, the morgue. The morgue is down the hall from the lab.
- 12 Yeah. I didn't even know you had an office.
- 13 Α Oh, yeah.
- 14All right. Now, you're pretty familiar with a lot of medical terminology and things like that. 15
 - I would think that working 30 years in the lab, Α yes, I am actually.
- What exactly do you do? 18
- I'm the assistant supervisor, and I help -- you 19 Α 2.0 know, I run the shift. You know, I can work in a department. If an instrument breaks down, I have 21 to help trouble shoot. I help with check out new 22 23 instruments. I help a little bit of this, a little 24 bit of that. I have various jobs. You know, it

- Q Would it be fair to say that you run the office despite that there -- there might be somebody else that actually is supposed to?
 - A The office?
- 5 Q Yeah.

2

3

4

8

16

- A We have -- we have people that run the office. I'm
 more the technical part.
 - Q But you keep it going.
- 9 A Absolutely, second shift.
- 10 O What is that?
- 11 A 3:30 to midnight I work.
- 12 Q All right. And I understood that you -- I can't

 13 hear very well back there. I understood that you

 14 had done something with one of the prosecutors

 15 here.
 - A Well, actually, I've been witness in a couple cases because we do, do chain of custody alcohols.
- 18 Q Okay. These were DUI cases?
- 19 A Pardon. Yes.
- 20 Q Driving while intoxicated?
- 21 A Yes, I don't remember the one; but the one was,
 22 yes. And then there was one that was from a few
 23 years ago that Mr. Williams -- I got subpoenaed,
 24 and I met with him, but it got settled out of court
- so I didn't go on that one.

- Q Okay. Do you feel -- how do you feel about being fair to the defendant in a case where the defendant is brought into court for a trial?
- A I believe I can be fair minded.
- Q Okay. Do you think you normally are?
- A I believe so, yes.
- Q Should our clients be concerned because of a person being in your frame of mind on a jury?
- A I hope not.

2.0

- Q Well, I'm asking you.
- 11 A I -- I'm a pretty fair minded person I believe.

 12 That's how I was raised.
 - Q I think most of us think we are. I'm wondering if you can look in yourself and see if you had any biassed. Most of us don't know if we do. And since you've been working in this field and working basically not just with medical things but in prosecution of cases, do you think that would --
 - A I've had limited -- I've only witnessed in three cases so I don't know that's extensive practice but --
 - Q Okay. Okay. And, Ms. Mark, tell me about your brother and sister I think you said.
 - A My sister has a law practice out in Arizona, and my brother is -- actually, he's studying law. He

lives out of the country. He's studying 1 international law. 2 Who is the police officer in your family? 3 Q I have two nephews by marriage: Chris Snyder and 4 Α 5 James Snyder. Do you have any other relatives that are serving as 6 7 police officers? Α No. 8 Do you have any of the attorney relatives of yours 9 Q 10 that are involved with criminal law either prosecution or defense? 11 12 Α No. 13 And you're a single parent now. Right? 14 Α Yes, I am. You just opened a new business. 15 0 16 When I filled out that paperwork, yes. No. Α 17 0 Are you still doing that? No, I'm not. 18 Α What are you doing now? 19 Q 20 Α I'm running an office for an artist, and she designs products, and then she has it manufactured 21 overseas. 22 23 Are these clothing articles? 24 Α No.

How do you like that?

- 1 Α I love it. If I'd ask -- if I ask you why wouldn't I want you 2 on the jury, don't tell me I would, just answer the 3 question, okay. Why wouldn't I want you on the 4 5 jury? That's a good question. I'm not sure unless it 6 7 would just be my medical background. Okay. Mrs. Mark? 0 8 Well, I would certainly weigh both sides of it. 9 Α 10 But like I said, I'm more apt to get hung up on some obscure fact. 11 12 But you know that about yourself. Q 13 Α Yes, I do. You think when it's 11 to 1 that you at least would 14 keep listening to what the others say not lock 15 16 yourself in the bathroom?
 - A No. I would keep listening to what they had to say.
 - Q Okay. And, Mr. Myers, same question. Why shouldn't I have you on the jury?
 - A I wouldn't know why you wouldn't want me on the jury. I really wouldn't. I'm an open-minded person, weigh the evidence.
 - MR. ZOOK: Thank you.

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: Mr. Crawford.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. CRAWFORD:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

- Q Ms. Truex, I believe you mentioned that your mother was potentially suffering from dementia, and you're still trying to figure out how to deal with it. Is that correct?
- A That's correct.
- Q Is the fact that we are dealing with a case involving a death of a lady that was 94 years of age, would that make it difficult for you to sit in this?
- A Not at all.
- Q Separate situation?
 - A Separate.
 - Q Anyone else of our new panel have any reservations concerning that particular issue; the fact, that the victim was 94 years of age?

(The juror indicated in the negative.)

Q Anything going on at home right now for our new panel that would make it difficult over the next couple of days to sit here and listen to the case? Any questions from our new panel about reasonable doubt, comments concerning that? Everyone understand that. Mr. Myers, any problem with the concept of reasonable?

- A I don't think so. I think it's been pretty much covered.
 - Q State's burden of proof. They got to show beyond a reasonable doubt?
- 5 A In my mind, yes.
 - O Ms. Truex?
 - A I don't have questions on that.
 - Q Any concerns with the issue of presumption of innocence? Ms. Truex, any problem with that?
- 10 A No.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

- 11 Q As Ms. Canen and Mr. Royer sit here they're
 12 presumed innocent.
- 13 A That's correct.
 - Q Okay. Mr. Myers, how do you go about making an important decision in your life?
 - A I guess I research a situation, pluses and minuses, and base my decisions on experience from those pluses and minuses. In business, you make decisions everyday; and they don't always work out, but you have to figure the pluses and minuses.

 What I mean there is the positive side of what the good side can happen if you make the right decision and the negative side if you make the wrong

decision. So you have to kind of go in the middle

there and figure it out.

Q Is it a long-term process for you, or is it something you quickly do?

- A That would depend upon the situation. Sometimes it's just like that; sometimes it's not.
- Q More complicated it is the longer of period of time it might take.
- A Depends on the gravity of the situation.
- Q Are you a leader or a follower?
- A That that depends on the situation. If I know what I'm doing, I'd rather be a leader. I'm not quite sure.
- Q Does that switch based upon the amount of information you think you gathered?
 - A Sure. You gather information you become a leader.
- Q Thank you, sir. Ms. Truex, how about you?
 - A I would probably characterize myself more of a leader.
 - Q Okay. How do you go about making a decision?
- A I like to get all the -- you know, what facts you can, and then, you know, use your experience and common sense and come to a decision. And, again, like he said too, it would depend on, you know, what -- situations are different. Sometimes it's easy to come to a decision; sometimes it's not.
- Q Okay. You mention that in your line of business or

you practice that you had come across all kinds of 1 people. And you didn't go much into detail about 2 3 that because I don't think you were what. What specifically do you mean by that? 4 I do have to go up and help draw patients in 5 Α emergency room and out patients at the hospital, so 6 7 you come across a wide swath of people in that --Comprehension abilities, or what do you mean by 0 8 that? 9 10 Α You name it cause the ER gets a little bit of 11 everything. 12 So some people are a little bit more astute than Q 13 other people. 14 Α Absolutely. So you do recognize differences of people. 15 0 16 Absolutely. Α 17 Ms. Mark, how do you make a major decision in your life? What do you do to come up with something? 18 Well, I don't make them very easily, but I try to 19 Α 2.0 gather as much information as I can. If I still don't feel confident, I ask people who know more 21 than I do for their input, and then I end up doing 22 23 what I feel is right. I can have all the facts 24 but, you know, I go with whatever my feeling is. 25 Q Okay. Are you a leader or a follower?

- A Well, I would say I'm a follower, but somehow I always get moved up. Maybe no one else wants the job.
- Q Like, Mr. Myers, in terms of starting out one way but the more information you gather you're more of a leader.
- A Yes.

Q Thank you. Anyone of our new panel have a friend or been the victim of a crime or acquaintance, any insight into that or been involved in anything like that? I'll take that as a no for everybody. Okay. Any of our new panel been on a jury before? Let me step back. I know Mr. Zook asked that, and I do apologize.

Ms. Mark, nothing about family members being police officers is in any way would impact your ability to separate and just consider the facts in this case. Am I fair in my assumption of that?

- A You're fair in your assumption that I would not, yes. That's a tricky question.
- Q I know I asked that incorrectly. Caught myself in the middle of that. Nothing -- because you have friends or family members that are police officers, are you more likely to believe the testimony of an officer the comes in here and testifies here over

233 the next couple of days? 1 2 Α No. 3 And you will give them whatever deference in looking at your common sense and your ability to 4 deduct and reason things you'll look at it all the 5 6 same way. 7 Α Yes. I would think that their powers of observation are going to be more than mine, but to 8 automatically believe whatever they had to say, no. 9 10 Q When you say "their powers of observation are better than yours," what do you mean by that? 11 12 Well, I just mean that they're more trained to Α 13 notice things that I wouldn't, you know, 14 necessarily. But their eyesight may not be better. 15 0 16 Their eyesight isn't better but --Α 17 0 Abilities to perceive and pick up on certain 18 things. Right. They may notice things I wouldn't. 19 Α 20 Q Okay. I think that is all I have. Thank you all. (Counsel approached the bench.) 21 THE COURT: Mr. Myers, Ms. Mark you'll be 22 23 Ms. Truex, welcome to the jury. Ms. Jackson

would you seat additional jurors. Seat No. 1 we now have

Christine Cupp, and in seat No. 9 we have Linda Lawson.

24

2.5

Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take a recess.

2.0

You are all prospective jurors in this case.

You are prohibited from discussing this case with anyone prior to the commencement of the evidentiary portion of the trial. To do so may result in a mistrial. After the presentation of evidence has begun, jurors may discuss the evidence presented amongst themselves in the jury room during recesses. All regular jurors and alternates must be present during such discussion. You must reserve judgement concerning the outcome of the case until jury deliberations begin.

You may not discuss the facts of this case with me or with the lawyers or with any of the witnesses.

attempt to obtain information outside the courtroom. It is highly improper for you to do so. You are also prohibited from reading any newspaper accounts of this case and from listening to or watching any radio or television reports relating to this trial. You are to consider and decide this case only upon the evidence received during the course of the trial here in the courtroom. Once again, you'll be in care of the bailiff.

(A short recess was had at this time.)

(The Court convened with all the

parties present. The prospective jury

entered the courtroom and the 1 2 following proceedings were had.) 3 THE COURT: Be seated, please. Ms. Becker. VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 4 5 BY MS. BECKER: Good afternoon. Almost evening, but the end is in 6 7 sight. That's the good news. First of all, Ms. Cupp, you and I are acquaintance with each other. 8 Is that exclusively from our business in the courts 9 10 in Superior Court 1 and 2. 11 Did you ever rent space from Graber Law Firm? 12 Q Yes. 13 Α Yes. 14 Okay. Then, yes, then we've come into contact with each other then as well. Anything about the fact 15 that you and I are acquaintances that you might 16 find to be -- make you a little uncomfortable being 17 fair an impartial in this case? 18 19 Α No. 20 All right. Do you have any questions so far? Q Α No. 21 All right. Ms. Lawson, what about you? 22 23 Anything thus far that you've heard or seen, 24 observed in some way in the courtroom that you 25 think might effect your ability to be fair and

```
1
            impartial?
 2
        Α
            No.
 3
        Q
            All right. Let's talk real quick about the
            principles, the legal principles you'll be dealing
 4
            with, felony murder as well as accessory liability
 5
            or accomplice liability. Do both of those concepts
 6
 7
            make sense to both of you, Mrs. Cupp?
        Α
            Yes.
 8
            And, Ms. Lawson?
 9
        Q
10
        Α
            Yes.
            Do you think that you can enforce both of those
11
        Q
12
            laws?
13
        Α
            Yes.
14
        Α
            Yes.
            Do either one of you think they're unfair in any
15
        0
16
            way, shape, or form?
17
        Α
            Nope.
18
        Α
            No.
            Fantastic. The concept of inferences versus
19
        Q
20
            speculation. Do you understand the differences
21
            between the two, Mrs. Lawson?
            Yes.
22
        Α
23
            All right. Describe them for me?
24
        Α
            A speculation is unknown maybe what if, and an
            inference is taking information and what comes
25
```

- common sense to draw a conclusion from.
- 2 Q Does that makes sense to you, Mrs. Cupp?
- 3 A Yes.
 - Q Do you want to add anything to that?
- 5 A No.

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

- Q Okay. The next thing we need to discuss are whether you have anything in your personal beliefs, your upbringing, your moral background, that kind thing that might effect your ability to be fair and impartial. Ms. Cupp?
- 11 A No.
- 12 Q Ms. Lawson, nothing.
- 13 A No.
 - Q All right. Anything about the fact that this case involves witnesses who may have a little more of a diminished mental perception then other people or the fact that the victim is an elderly woman, either of those things have any impact on you?
- 19 A No.
- Q Will you keep and open mind and listen to all of
 the evidence before you make any decisions in this
 case. Ms. Cupp?
- 23 A Yes.
- 24 O Ms. Lawson?
- 25 A Yes.

- 0 The concept of reasonable doubt. What does that mean to you, Mrs. Cupp?
- Α That concept of it?

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Yes. What does it mean to you if I say tell me 4 Q what reasonable doubt is. How would you put it into your own words? 6
 - Anything that's out of reason. Α
 - Okay. When Mr. Williams was up here the first 0 round, he made a comment about there's reasonable doubt there's unreasonable doubt. What's the difference between the two?
 - Reasonable is more fair. Unreasonable would be Α unfair. Like, it's further away from reason.
 - Okay. That makes sense. Does it make sense to you also that unreasonable doubt is more like speculation? It's grasping, trying to come up with something. Understand how that is not permissible as far as speculating is concerned?
- 19 Α Yes.
- 20 Make sense to you? Q
- Α Yes. 21
- Mrs. Lawson, do you agree with that? 22
- 23 Α Yes.
- 24 0 Okay. Any questions on that topic?
- 2.5 Α No.

- Q Okay. Do either one of you, Ms. Lawson, you first, have any special knowledge or skilled information about forensic evidence, about the rules of evidence, rules of trial procedure, or mental -- or mental illnesses?
- 6 A No.

2.0

- Q Mrs. Cupp?
 - A I work for the Elkhart County Courthouse in

 Elkhart, but, I mean, I just process paperwork. I

 don't really get into all that technical stuff.
 - Q Don't get into the details.
- 12 A Right.
 - Q Do either one of you have anything that I failed to ask you that you think we ought to know about in order to make an educated decision? Ms. Lawson.
 - A I was a victim of a crime this summer, a robbery.
 - Q Okay. How -- let me ask you this. The fact that you were a victim of a crime this summer, do you believe that that will impact you in such a way in this trial that it might effect your abilities to be fair or impartial to either side?
 - A I don't think it will.
 - Q You don't think it will. Was it a traumatic enough experience for you that it's going to be difficult for you now to sit in this chair?

A No.

2.0

- Q No. Mrs. Cupp, anything about you?
- 3 A No.
 - Q All right. Questions from either one of you?
 - A No. But I want to mention another thing. I

 work -- where I work, I work for child protective

 services, and right now I serve as a clerk. I have

 been a case manager in the past, and I just wanted

 to let you know about that.
 - Q Sure. Fortunately, it's not child victim type case. There are no child witnesses in this situation. So as far as those special skills that you have probably won't come into play in this case. On the other hand, you've had some exposure to the system. Did you ever have to testify because of any of your dealings with CPS?
 - A Yes.
 - Q All right. Anything about your preparation, your testifying, or your being a witness in a specific case because of your association with CPS, do you think any of that might effect your ability to be fair and impartial?
 - A I don't think so, no.
 - Q Okay. All right. Can you think of anything else because that's a couple of big things that I didn't

1 ask you the right questions for. So can you think of anything else that you think might effect you or 2 nibble at you a little bit as you're trying to 3 listen to evidence a make a decision in this case? 4 No. I've been listening all day, and the one thing 5 Α was the case management that I wanted you all to be 6 7 aware of. Okay. Very good. Thank you. Appreciate that. 0 8 Anything else? 9 10 Α No. 11 Α No. 12 Q Thank you both very much. Mr. Zook. 13 THE COURT: Mr. Zook. VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 14 15 BY MR. ZOOK: Hi. I take it, Mrs. Lawson, that the State of 16 17 Indiana work you do is for child protective services? 18 That's correct. 19 Α 20 How long have you done that? Q Α I have been there -- this is the second time in 21 working for them. I'm coming up on two years the 22 23 majority of that as a unit clerk. 16 years ago, I 24 worked in the capacity as a case manager for four 25 years.

- Q Okay. What did you do in the meantime?
- A I raised my children, I did substitute teaching, I

 did some contract home studies for adoptions, that

 kind of thing.
 - Q Largely concerned with children then.
 - A Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

20

21

22

23

24

- Q Gee, I see you're almost as old as I am. What did you do before that?
 - A Well, I was nontraditional student when I went to get me preparation for doing social work. So I've been a stay-at-home mom for that previous marriage.
 - Q Okay. Thank you. Do you understand the concept that the state has to prove the crimes beyond a reasonable doubt?
- 15 A Yes, I believe I do.
 - Q What does beyond a reasonable doubt mean to you?
- 17 A It means with a strong assurance and that the
 18 reasonable doubt has to be something that
 19 plausible. In other words not --
 - Q Okay. Something that comes from the evidence or a hole in the evidence perhaps.
 - A Yes.
 - Q And it wouldn't be, for example, that someone came down from a flying saucer and committed the crime, and that's why our clients are not guilty. But if

you find that hole in the evidence or if you find 1 2 that the case just doesn't seem plausible, would 3 you be able to vote not guilty? Absolutely. 4 Α And now, Ms. Cupp, I don't know that we've met I 5 think maybe once; but I don't know people on a 6 7 first name basis in Elkhart. Try not to go there as often as I can. So you worked also for the 8 Theora Graber I see. 9 10 Α Correct. You've had contact with criminal cases before? 11 12 When I worked for Theora, it was mostly family law Α 13 so not really. I just started working at the 14 Elkhart Courthouse in October, and I haven't dealt with the criminal cases yet. 15 16 And you hadn't really dealt with them with Theora Q 17 either. No. 18 Α Did you have any criminal -- accused criminals 19 Q 2.0 coming into your office? No. They did mostly family law. They did no 21 Α 22 criminal. That's even worse, isn't it? Are you accustomed to 23 24 thinking that if somebody's arrested he or she

probably committed the crime or he wouldn't have

- been arrested in the first place?
- A No.

- Q There was some talk about assisting in a crime or being -- being a person who aids, assists, or causes a crime being as guilty as the person who does the crime. What would happen if the crime were committed and then another person gave aid to the person that committed the crime, do you know?
- A They're still -- they still took part in it.
- Q Took part in the crime itself.
- A Can you -- can you repeat the question?
- Q Sure. What would happen if a person commits a crime and after the crime another person gets involved in that crime, is that the same thing?
 - A How are you saying involved in the crime?
- Q By helping the person who had originally committed the crime.
 - A Well, then they're taking part in that in helping that person commit that crime.
 - Q Could I change your mind? How do you feel,

 Mrs. Lawson?
- A I don't know the answer to that.
- Q It's something that the Judge would have to tell
 you I think. I'm not going to try to tell you
 about that. But, basically, if you're aiding or

assisting a person committing a crime would be 1 different than aiding or assisting a person after 2 the crime's committed. When I put it that way, 3 does it make more sense? 4 You're still aiding but in a different 5 Α circumstance. 6 7 Yeah. What if you commit a crime and I help you Q ten years later? 8 9 Α With the crime or how? What do you mean by --10 Q With anything. With anything. 11 Α 12 Or maybe to conceal a crime or something like that. Q 13 I know I've got you into unexplored areas here, but basically can you understand that aiding or 14 assisting in committing the crime is -- is 15 different than aiding or assisting after the crime 16 has been committed? 17 After the fact is what you're saying? 18 Α Yeah. Do you have any question of me? 19 Q 20 Α No. Okay. Now, do either of you two know anybody else? 21 Q Our daughters this summer they're playing --22 23 they're hoping today to make the volleyball team at 24 the same school. 25 Q Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Crawford. 1 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 2 3 BY MR. CRAWFORD: Good evening, I should say. 4 THE COURT: If anyone has a cell phone or a 5 pager or whatever, you need to shut it off? 6 7 BY MR. CRAWFORD: Ms. Cupp, in your time at the clerk's office in 8 Superior Court 2, have you and the other clerks 9 10 talked about criminal cases or things of that nature? 11 12 Yes. Α 13 Q Okay. Do you think that given those conversations 14 they may in any way influence your ability to carefully listen to facts in this case or make a 15 determination in this case? 16 17 Α No. When you talked about the cases, did you talk about 18 0 them in a negative way? 19 2.0 Α It was more in a learning way so that I could learn what paperwork went with what cases. 21 So more of a process kind of thing, not about 22 23 specific people or the case itself, but more about 24 how this got processed and why it got processed a 25 certain way.

A Right.

2.0

- Q Okay. And it was my understanding you never at the Graber Law Firm came into contact with criminal type of cases.
- A No.
 - Q Ms. Lawson, in your experience, probably want to back to about 16 years or so ago when you were a case manager. I believe you mentioned that you had to testify in criminal cases. Is that correct, or in cases --
 - A In cases.
 - Q Not necessarily criminal. During the period of time that you were involved as a case manager or today, have you had contact with police officers?
 - A Yes.
 - Q And in what capacity have you had contact with police officers?
 - A Well, 16 years ago there were officers that were things were done a little differently than they are now. When you were on call, you had frequent contact with whatever officers were working cause officers are the ones that take protective custody of children even though a caseworker is there from the Department of Child Services so there were officers that you'd get to know.

- Q Are you more likely to believe the testimony of an officer because of your involvement with them in the past then with Child Protective Services?
- A No. I don't believe they're different people than you and I.
 - Q They just take the information that they've gathered, but there's no special ability that they have.
 - A I believe they can be more experienced at testifying and more comfortable in that, but not that they have some special way of knowing that than you or I do.
 - Q In your capacity with Child Protective Services, what kind of children have you dealt with?
 - A All ages of children from infants to teenagers, all kinds of children, all kinds of parents.
 - Q So different levels of emotional growth, would that be something that you would have come into contact with?
- A Absolutely.
- Q People with more of a -- some with more mental deficiencies than others?
- 23 A Yes.

Q Have you been able to observe the differences in those kind of individuals?

- 1 A Yes.
- 2 Q And how they handle or respond to situation.
- 3 A Yes.
- 4 Q And you gathered that during the period of time 5 that you were the child protective services.
- 6 A Yes.
- Q Is that something that you continue to experience,
 or are you just more of a processor now than you
 were?
- 10 A I'm in the office now.
- 11 Q Okay. So you're not really coming into contact

 12 with people necessarily.
- 13 A That's correct.
- 14 Q Anything going on in either one of your lives right
 15 now that would make it difficult to hear this case
 16 over the next two days, two or three days?
- 17 A No.
- 18 A No.
- 19 Q Elkhart Superior Court No. 1 will be able to 20 survive?
- 21 A They'll survive.
- Q Any of the two of you have any friends or families
 members that are police officers?
- A I have an acquaintance Frank Thomas from the
 Elkhart PD. His daughter and my daughter are

- friends and have been for years.
- Q Is -- is the fact -- I believe you mentioned when Mr. Zook was up here or Ms. Becker that you had been a victim of a crime, is that correct, this summer?
- A This summer.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

- Q This summer. What has happened with that case?
- A It's a juvenile matter. It was my neighbor. And the young man is in boy's school. All of our belongings were recovered.
- Q So you were able to see the effects of that and actually -- how did you -- you were able to see the process working there. Is that correct?
- A Yes. As much as you see a juvenile process. It's closed, of course, juvenile; but the young man admitted to the crime, and we had gotten everything back even before that because they weren't very clever.
- Q So they were other pieces of information that led it to believe it was that young man.
- A It was that young man and some friends.
- Q Okay. So there were pieces of information that
 were gathered that could get you to that point.
 - A Yes.
- 25 Q Okay. Anything about that incident that would make

```
it difficult for you to sit and judge -- in
 1
            judgment over the next couple days in this case?
 2
 3
        Α
            No.
            Will you be able to separate that particular
 4
        Q
            incident and only consider the facts of this case?
            Yes.
 6
        Α
 7
            For either one of you, is there anything about this
        Q
            particular case that if you were Mr. Royer or
 8
            Ms. Canen that you would not want yourself on the
 9
10
            jury because of certain things that we've already
            talked about?
11
12
        Α
            No.
13
        Α
            No.
14
        Q
            Any problems with the issues or the doctrine of
            presumption of innocence?
15
16
            No.
17
        Α
            No.
            Thank you very much.
18
        Q
19
                      (The counsel approached the bench.)
2.0
                THE COURT: Ms. Cupp, you'll be excused.
      Lawson, welcome to the jury. In seat No. 1 we now have
21
      Ms. Kelly, correct?
22
23
                A JUROR: Yes.
24
                THE COURT: Mr. Williams.
                MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, your Honor.
25
```

```
252
 1
      STATE OF INDIANA )
                                IN THE ELKHART CIRCUIT COURT
 2
                          ) SS:
                                CAUSE NO: 20C01-0309-MR-00155
      COUNTY OF ELKHART
                          )
 3
      STATE OF INDIANA,
 4
           v.
 6
      ANDREW M. ROYER,
 7
           Defendant.
 8
                              VOLUME II
10
                Reporter's transcript of the proceedings in the
11
12
      above-entitled matter commenced on Monday, August 8,
13
      2005; Tuesday, August 9, 2005; and Wednesday, August 10,
      2005, before the HONORABLE TERRY C. SHEWMAKER, Judge of
14
15
      the Elkhart Circuit Court, Goshen, Indiana.
16
17
18
19
2.0
21
      APPEARANCES:
22
      FOR THE STATE OF INDIANA: Vicki Elaine Becker and Denise
23
      A. Robinson
24
      FOR THE DEFENDANT CANEN: R. Brent Zook
2.5
      FOR THE DEFENDANT ROYER: Christopher C. Crawford
```

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 1 BY MR. WILLIAMS: 2 3 It's just you and I. Ms. Kelly, is there anything you've heard sitting outside the jury panel that 4 5 you want to talk about? 6 Α No. 7 Is there anything that came up that is in your mind Q that would lead you to believe that you couldn't be 8 fair and impartial in this case? 9 10 Α No. You've heard the concepts of felony murder and 11 Q 12 accomplice liability numerous times. 13 Α Yes. 14 Q Any -- any questions about those concepts? 15 Α No. Do you believe that you could enforce felony murder 16 Q 17 and accomplice liability if it's before you? 18 Α Yes. Do you believe they're fair? 19 Q 20 А Yes. The concepts of inference and speculation that 21 0 we've talked about, did you hear that? 22 23 Α Yes. 24 0 Why don't you tell me what you believe that the differences between the two? 25

- A Well, inference is more -- I'm trying to think how
 I explain it. Iffy, more what if type of things,
 and the other one would be that it's more possible.
- Q Okay. So let's start with cause I'm not sure which one you were talking about. Talk about speculation first. What does speculation mean to you? Say somebody is speculating about something.
- A Okay. Then they're -- I'm not even sure how I'd put this. You're speculating that there's a possibility that this could be the fact.
- Q And when you talk about inference, did you understand -- I mean, what -- what -- what comes to mind when you hear about inference?
- A If this should happen.

Q The words and you've been -- you were back there when we were talking about these things. It's actually switched. I mean, when you look at definitions and we think about those things, speculation is really the what ifs. You're speculating. It's a guess potentially.

Inference is more you take your common sense, your life experience, you kind of put the pieces together, and then you come to a conclusion.

Regardless of the terminology, do you -- do you understand the difference between I guess something

that's a quess and something that actually is more 1 2 concrete? 3 Α Yes. And that you can't have decisions based on 4 Q speculation. And you're going to hear evidence 5 from the witness stand and that's what you're to 6 7 base your decision on, things that go on in the courtroom. Not that you can't bring your common 8 sense and your life experiences in. Any questions 9 10 about that? 11 Α No. 12 Any difficulty with that? 13 Α No. Anything in your personal beliefs that you believe 14 Q would make you not be fair and impartial in this 15 16 case? 17 Α No. Have you ever been a victim of a crime? 18 Q 19 Α No. 20 Q Do you -- have you ever had any family members be victims of crime? 21 22 Α Yes. 23 Q Give me a -- who? 24 Α Well, I had are sister that was robbed. 25 Q How long ago was that?

- A Goodness. It's been six or seven years ago.
 - Q Anything about that incident with your sister that would have some effect on you as you sit in the courtroom if you had to sit in the courtroom and listen to this case?
 - A No.

- Q Okay. Anything about the fact that you may hear testimony from witnesses or that the victim in this case is an older individual, elderly, she was 94 years old, any problem hearing that type of evidence or anything in your background that would lead you to not be fair and impartial?
- A No.
 - Q The concept of beyond a reasonable doubt. You've heard us talk about that. Tell me what that means to you beyond a reasonable doubt?
 - A That means that the puzzle pieces fit for the most part. There might be some gaps here or there but that you can still see the whole picture.
 - Q And so that you don't have to have everything there, but you need to be able to see the picture.
- A Yes.
- Q Do you have any special knowledge, skill, medical field, law enforcement, in your background?
- 25 A Medical.

- 1 Q What is that?
- 2 A I'm an RN.
- Q And where are you an RN at?
 - A Elkhart General Hospital.
- Q As an RN, do you deal with all sorts of different types of people?
- 7 A Yes.

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

- 8 Q And how do you feel about that?
 - A They're individuals. Everybody is different.
- 10 Q Do you treat people the same when they come in?
- 11 A No. You have to treat them according to their own 12 special qualities and their own intellect.
 - Q So somebody who may not be as intelligent as somebody else you have to deal with differently.
 - A Right. We explain a little bit more, maybe give a little more detail; but they have to understand why they're there and what they're facing and any risks involved.
 - Q Is there anything about the fact that you deal with different types of people, do you think that would make you a particularly good or bad juror?
- 22 A Probably better.
- 23 Q Why do you think that?
- A Because you're used to dealing with different
 personalities and different people in different

- levels, and you can understand the differences and how they perceive things.
- Q You get an idea of how to understand what -- how people understand things I guess. Not eloquently said but. Is there anything that I haven't asked you that you want to tell me about yourself that you think that I should know?
- A I have an acquaintance that works in Elkhart on the police force.
- O And who is that?
- A His name is Mike Sigsbee. He's a detective.
- 12 Q Is there anything about your relationship with Mike
 13 Sigsbee that would effect you ability to be fair
 14 and impartial in this case?
- 15 A No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- Q What do you do in your free time?
- 17 A I read, garden, motorcycle.
- 18 Q Have much time for TV?
- A Not much. I like TV that you don't have to think a lot about: Comedies, old movies. I like the old movies.
- 22 Q You said you like to read. What do you read?
- A A variety, I mean, I'll read just about anything.

 But I think my favorite would be some of the older
- 25 novels like Gone With the Wind, those type of

things. 1 2 Q Romances. Have you or has anyone in you family ever been a party to or been involved in a lawsuit? 3 А No. 4 5 Q Have you ever been juror in a case? Α Yes. 6 Do you want to be a juror? 7 Q Α Yeah. 8 9 Q And why? 10 Α I just think the whole concept is interesting. Anything in particular that's interesting, I mean, 11 Q 12 when you say that --13 Α I just mean the whole magnetism of the whole thing. 14 I mean, you know, it's interesting to see how a 15 judge reacts to certain things and how each individual does their job. 16 17 0 No more questions. THE COURT: Mr. Zook. 18 19 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 20 BY MR. ZOOK: Ms. Kelly, where do you work again? 21 Q Elkhart General Hospital. 22 Α 23 Q Okay. And you worked at some other hospital or 24 some other place before as a nurse? 25 Α Yes.

- Q Where was that?
- 2 A In Columbus, Ohio.
- Q And was that in a hospital?
- 4 A Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

- Q Okay. Have you always worked in a hospital?
- A No, I haven't. I've worked in nursing homes, I've worked in home care.
 - Q You read Danielle Steel?
 - A Yes. Not much, but I have read his books, yes.

 Her books I should say.
 - Q You know anyone else on the panel?
- 12 A No, I don't.
 - Q All right. Something you said concerned me a little bit concerning how sure you have to be to find somebody guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, and you said there could be some gaps in the evidence. You understand those would have to be unreasonable gaps in order to -- maybe you're saying something good, and maybe you're not. I'm just not quite understanding exactly what you meant by that.

When you're looking for reasonable doubts you're looking for holes in the evidence, things that haven't been proven beyond a reasonable doubt. The elements of the case being that there was a robbery, not another kind of a crime, but a

robbery, and that someone was killed in the course of it other than one of the perpetrators.

So when you're looking at those two things, you need to see that those things have been proven beyond a reasonable doubt. And you'll hear an instruction from the judge that has to do with you being fully convinced that the people that are on trial are guilty of the crime before you say guilty. You think you can do that?

A Yes.

2.0

- Q Okay. What does that mean to you? It's just another couple of words like beyond a reasonable doubt or fully convinced as being equivalent or still other words? What does it mean to you?
- A That they brought forth enough facts that paints the picture that, yes, this is what has happened.
- Q Okay. Okay. And the speculation would be even though they did that, something else might have happened to make it look that way perhaps that way. You understand what I'm talking about?
- A Yes.
 - Q You can use inferences which come from the facts that have been shown. It's Like you can deduce things like any normal person from the facts that are shown to you, but you can't just go out and

grab ahold of maybes. Okay. You've never been on 1 2 a jury. No. I've been part of the jury selection, but then 3 at the last minute they plea bargained, and we were 4 all dismissed. So I never was actually part of the 5 jury to say that I heard any of the evidence. 6 7 Okay. Thank you. You have any questions of me? Α No. 8 THE COURT: Mr. Crawford. 9 10 MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you, your Honor. VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 11 12 BY MR. CRAWFORD: 13 Ms. Kelly, anything going on at work or at home 14 right now that would make it difficult for you to sit as a juror over the next couple of days? 15 16 Α No. 17 Anything about the doctrine of presumption of innocence that you had questions about or you were 18 concerned about or it was difficult for you to 19 2.0 understand? Α 21 No. You understand that as Ms. Canen and Mr. Royer sit 22 23 here they're presumed innocent? 24 Α Yes. 25 And is that something that you can practice

throughout the course of this trial if you're 1 2 selected? 3 Α Yes. Are you leader a or a follower? 4 I tend to be both depending on what the circumstances are. 6 7 And when you say that, what do you mean Q circumstances? 8 If its something I'm knowledgeable about, I feel 9 Α 10 comfortable in leading; but there's time that if I'm not knowledgeable about a subject, that 11 12 sometimes I can follow until I develop more 13 knowledge. 14 Okay. You mention I believe also that in your capacity as a registered nurse you have worked with 15 nursing homes or in nursing homes. Is that 16 17 correct? 18 Yes, I have. Α Is the fact that the victim in this case was 94 19 Q 2.0 years of age cause some concern or should have caused some concern for my client and Mr. Zook's 21 client given your involvement with individuals in 22 23 nursing homes? 24 Α I don't think so. You'll be able to separate that experience solely 25

only upon facts that you hear over the next couple of days?

A Yes.

2.0

Q I think that's all I have, thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Kelly, welcome to the jury.

Ms. Becker.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MS. BECKER:

- Q Good evening, ladies. Okay. First of all, I want to let you know what the alternate does. Have either of you served on a jury before?
- A No.
- 13 A No.
 - No. All right. The alternate juror has the responsibility of paying 100 percent attention just like all the other jurors do. You have to pay attention to virtually every fact of evidence that comes in. Reason being is that if one of the regular members of the panel something happens, then you have to jump in and hit the ground running in the discussion. The hard part of this is you absolutely may not participate in any deliberation prior to your taking the seat in a regular area. For some people, it's no problem. They like being in the background, you know, it's no problem. For

- other people, they have the hard time keeping quiet when everybody else is going one way and you're stuck on something else. Do both of you think you can do this job?
- A If it's something I feel passionately about, sometimes I have to keep my mouth in check because I want to add my two cents.
- Q I'm the say way. I know. I am not capable of being an alternate. I can't keep my mouth shut. I know myself that well. Question is: Can you keep your mouth shut even though, even if it's passionate, even if it's all you can do to maintain yourself, can you keep yourself under control?
- A I'd like to think that I could in something this serious; but at that the same time, in my opinion if it sounds like someone isn't making sense of what was presented, I'd feel like I need to correct that.
- Q Okay. Here's what would happen. If you jump in, you got to start the process all over again. Okay. Knowing that would be the consequence, do you think that you would be able to at least stay out, turn your head?
- A Yes.

2.0

Q And, ma'am, what about you?

- A Knowing the consequence, yes, I could keep my mouth shut.
- Q Okay. Very good. And whomever the foreman is on the jury will also keep you in check as well because they'll tell us if you start talking; but, you know, that's the hardest part really of being an alternate juror. Now, aside from that, if you do get called in to serve on the panel, these legal concepts we've discussed, felony murder and accomplice liability, do they make sense to both of you?
- A Yes. But I don't agree with it.

- Q Okay. Tell me what part you don't agree with.
- Earlier this morning the example you gave was someone is in the get-away car another person was in the convenience store, hit someone with the pipe, that person happened to die. I do not think that the driver of the car should be held accountable for murder, although they are guilty of taking part in a crime, they're not guilty cause they did not wield that weapon.
- Q Okay. Thank you for your candidness on this. I truly appreciate it because there are many people who feel the same way you do. That's not what the say in the State of Indiana. The law -- as

Mr. Zook indicated earlier, there's only one kind of murder. And while there's only one kind of murder, it's true, we don't have different degrees of murder. There are two different types. You've have flat out murder where somebody kills somebody. I mean, it's one person killing another human being.

You've also got felony murder where you intend to commit the felony and during that felony a person gets killed, and that's the way it is in the State of Indiana. So my question to you knowing you as you know you best, can you follow the law of the State of Indiana which says go against what you believe because if you find that they aided induced or caused this offense in any way, shape, or form you have to find them guilty. Can you ignore your own moral standing and follow the law? You want me to come back to you on that?

- A I'd like to answer.
- Q Feel free, yeah.

- A I'm the one who has to live with whatever decision

 I make, and it would be hard if I was only given -
 if that's it, that's hard. I need not a way out,

 but I need there to be another type.
- Q All right. Let me ask you this then. If the State

of Indiana did prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt the situation that I just -- the hypothetical we talked about earlier, the driver of the car knew that the person had a pipe. Didn't necessarily know they were going to use it, but knew they had a pipe, knew it was possible, and it happened. In that situation, and say it was all proven, all the facts were proven to you, in that situation, would you come back guilty on the driver?

10 A For murder.

2.0

- Q For murder, felony murder.
 - A They have no control over what that person did with that pipe. They only had control over the fact that they helped get them there, drove the car, and took part in the robbery.
 - Q Then let me ask this question again. Obviously, this is a very strong principle in your belief, and you're right. You got to sleep at night. Knowing the way that you feel about this but yet knowing that the law of the State of Indiana is different than that, would you enforce the law or would you as you indicated find a way around it?
 - A The law is there for a reason. That's the state I live in. It's what I have to uphold.
 - Q Okay. So you believe you could do it?

A I'd have to.

- Q Okay. That's what I needed to know. Thank you very much. Ma'am, do you feel the same way?
- A No. You explained about the pipe and the driver, and driver knew that the person committing the robbery had the pipe. It's possible then that something could happen to harm somebody. The driver knows, the driver made the choice to still go ahead with whatever was planned and done it. So basically they have made their choice, and they have to be responsible.
- Q Okay. Thank you. I appreciate you information as well. Let's go ahead and talk about any sympathies that either one of you may have. Do either one of you feel like you would allow yourself to be swayed, or you would allow your perception of the evidence to be swayed because either there's an elderly victim, or their may be individuals that have not as much mental sophistication as other people do? Do you think either one of those things might effect your abilities here?
- A No.
 - A I worked in a nursing home, and I now work for a medical office that deals mainly with the elderly, and I would do my best. I can't say that I would

- be swayed either way, but I do (inaudible).
- Q Thank you. We all appreciate that information because while it indicates you work in the medical field it doesn't indicates that you work specifically or have with elderly people. And, once again, it's a situation where you got to make sure you've got the right people. So while that may an issue, do you think that you would still hold true to being fair an impartial to making sure we did our job?
- 11 A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

- Q Okay. Very good. Very good. Any strong feelings about law enforcement, lawyers in general, the court system, the justice system, that either one of you think we ought to know about in order to make an educated decision?
- 17 A No.
- 18 A No.
- 19 Q Any questions of me?
- 20 A No.
- 21 A No.
- Q Okay. Concept of beyond a reasonable doubt make sense to both of you?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q Do you think you're going to know it when you see

it, Mrs. Copen? 1 2 Α Yes. 3 Q And what about you, Ms. Breetzke? А Yes. 4 5 Q You indicated you do have a -- do you have a masters degree? 6 7 Α Yes. What is your degree? 0 8 Environmental science. 9 Α 10 Q What made you select that? I like science, and I -- there's just the 11 Α 12 environment is more broad than something specific, 13 and there's so many topics within it that you don't 14 have to -- you don't have to be stuck with just chemistry or geology. You can -- it's a more of a 15 16 broad range. And, Ms. Copen, is your child old enough now that 17 you're comfortable with your child care? You're 18 working now. Correct? 19 20 А Yes. Not a problem. All right. And I'm assuming that 21 Q your further education was in the nursing field? 22 23 No. Actually, it was medical billing. Α 24 0 In medical billing. Okay. All right. Thank you both very much. 25

THE COURT: Mr. Zook. 1 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 2 3 BY MR. ZOOK: I only have one question for the two of you. You 4 understand that a person doesn't have to take the stand in his or her own defense. Right? 6 7 Α Yes. And does that bother you at all? 8 A little bit. 9 Α 10 0 I thought it might bother you. Would you take the stand in your defense? 11 12 Α I would like to. I don't think it's natural to not 13 want to defend yourself against either a verbal or 14 physical assault. Okay. And when people are charging you with a 15 crime you want to get up there. Right? 16 17 Α Yes. Can you understand that there may be reasons a 18 0 19 person doesn't take the witness stand? 20 А Yes. And you wouldn't hold it against a person if the 21 0 person didn't take the stand. Right? 22 23 I would question why they didn't, but I wouldn't 24 hold it against them. Like, they have an ulterior 25 motive.

- Q Okay. I guess -- the instruction you're going to be given will tell you not to speculate on what reason it may be that the person doesn't take the witness stand, but to simply go with the evidence that's presented to you. Can you do it?
- A I think so.

- Q And you won't let a person's failure to take the witness stand weigh against that person?
- A I would try not let it.
- Q You think you can? When you say you try, you're pretty good at that?
- A Yeah. I would think it wouldn't effect too much.
- 13 Q Thank you. Heather, how about you?
 - A Well, I like her, I think it's natural for any human being to want to protect themself against an allegation whether it be physical or verbal; however, I do understand that there are reasons that people may not want to take the witness stand. I don't think that I would be swayed either way.
 - Q Okay. We're talking about it now. Once you actually receive the case, you probably won't be wondering those things as, much but I do need to know how you stand now. Is that the new Harry Potter?
- 25 A Yes.

- Q I don't know if I'd be able to get through this part of the day if I were reading that. Have you heard everything that we've been talking about?
- A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

- Q Do you have any questions about it at all?
- A No.
- Q The prosecutors and the defense people all kind of agree on what the law is and on what your job is.

 Have you pretty much figured that out by now?
- A Uh-huh.
- Q Do you have any questions?
- 12 A No.
- THE COURT: Mr. Crawford.
- MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you, your Honor.

15 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. CRAWFORD:

The prosecutor talked about the concepts of felony murder last time she was up here, also talked about the concepts of accessory liability. I believe Mr. Zook mentioned the concept of when he was up at one point in time during the panel selection aiding after the fact. Any problem with understanding that to be a different principle, or do you all think the same that that's as much a guilty as an accessory or felony murder? Any questions about

that concept? 1 Could you redefine it? 2 Okay. He mentioned, Mr. Zook mentioned essentially 3 Q that what if you knew something ten years after the 4 fact and then you attempted with someone else to 5 help cover it up, I believe that's what he 6 7 mentioned when he was up here previously, and I think he was trying get at with the other panel 8 members that he was talking to the differences in 9 10 the concept between being an accessory at the time versus one say ten years later after the action has 11 12 already happened. Any problem with the concept 13 that those are two different concepts? 14I don't think so. There's a difference, but I understand the difference. 15 16 You understand the difference. One happens a Q little bit later obviously not at the time the 17 first incident took place the separate action. 18 19 Α Yes. 20 How about you? Q They -- so if I get this straight, they helped 21 Α commit the crime --22

23

24

25

Q

No.

Q And helped to hide evidence or something like that.

- A Yeah. They're still assisting in that crime.
- Q The original crime.

THE COURT: Counsel, approach the bench,

4 please.

1

2

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

(An off-the-record discussion was held

at the bench.)

THE COURT: Proceed.

BY MR. CRAWFORD:

- Q Now, Ms. Copen, you mentioned that you are working with -- as an assistant you work with the elderly from time to time or you're doing that now. Is that correct?
- A Yes.
 - And is -- I believe you kind of mentioned or brought up the fact that -- that may cause some difficulties for you if you were called upon to be a juror in this case. Could you knowing the nature and the facts of this case involved a 94-year-old woman, could you separate your current involvement with people in the nursing home and just simply listen to the facts of this case and make a decision solely based upon the whether or not the action itself was committed and it was committed, in fact, by our clients?
- A Yes.

- Q You can separate that out and not have any feelings or sympathy because of the nature of the situation and because of your line of work?
- A I would have sympathy for the elderly that this happened to; but, no, that would have no bias on how I felt towards that.
- Q Okay. You're just going to listen to the evidence that you hear.
- 9 A Correct.

2

3

4

6

7

8

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 10 Q Ms. Breetzke, how do you make major decision in
 11 your life?
 - A The ones I've had to make I basically look at it it's a do it or don't do it type of decision. It's not an either or. I just figure what's the worst that could happen. If I'm willing to deal with it, then okay.
 - Q How about you, Ms. Copen?
 - A I weigh the pros and cons, decide which -- if I really want it or if I did something that I can do without, and base my decision on that.
 - Q Is it a long decision process or a short decision process?
- 23 A Depends on how bad I want it.
- Q Okay. So it varies in length depending upon the circumstance of the situation?

Α Yes. 1 I have no additional questions thank you. 3 Α Am I allowed to add something based on questions I've heard earlier today? 4 THE COURT: Let's hear what you have to say? My father works for the county sheriff's department 6 over at work release. My sister's apartment was 7 broken into a couple of weeks ago, and he's asked 8 several questions about innocent until proven 9 10 guilty, and I have a little problem with that. THE COURT: You don't believe that is the law 11 12 of this state? 13 A JUROR: I know it is the law. 14 THE COURT: You have a problem following that 15 law. A JUROR: Yes. I believe if it's come to this 16 point and there are people that -- they're fingers being 17 pointed at then they must have done something. 18 19 THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. 20 Counsel, we need your strikes. 21 (Counsel approached the bench.) THE COURT: Ms. Breetzke, you'll be excused. 22 23 Ms. Copen will you move forward one seat. And we now 24 have Mr. Stull. 25 A JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Stull, we're going to take a recess before we question you. It's been about an hour and a half since the jury's had a recess.

2.0

Ladies and gentlemen, you are all prospective jurors in this case. You are prohibited from discussing this case with anyone prior to the commencement of the evidentiary portion of the trial. To do so may result in a mistrial. After the presentation of evidence has begun, jurors may discuss the evidence presented amongst themselves in the jury room during recesses. All regular jurors and alternates must be present during such discussion. You must reserve judgement concerning the outcome of the case until jury deliberations begin.

You may not discuss the facts of this case with me or with the lawyers or with any of the witnesses.

You may not investigate the case yourselves or attempt to obtain information outside the courtroom. It is highly improper for you to do so. You are also prohibited from reading any newspaper accounts of this case and from listening to or watching any radio or television reports relating to this trial. You are to consider and decide this case only upon the evidence received during the course of the trial here in the courtroom. You'll be in care of the bailiff.

(A short recess was had at this time.)

```
(The Court convened with all the
 1
 2
                     parties present. The prospective jury
                     entered the courtroom and the
 3
                     following proceedings were had.)
 4
 5
                THE COURT: Be seated, please. Mr. Williams.
      BY MR. WILLIAMS:
 6
 7
            Good evening. Mr. Stull, is that right?
        Α
            Yes.
 8
            Mr. Stull, is there anything in particular that you
 9
        Q
10
            wanted to talk to me about after hearing many
            rounds of jury selection, has anything struck you
11
12
            that you wanted to talk about?
13
        Α
            No.
14
            Is there anything that we talked about or anything
            in your background, personal beliefs, that you
15
            believe would prevent you from being fair and
16
17
            impartial in this case?
18
        Α
            No.
            The concepts of felony murder and accomplice
19
        Q
2.0
            liability we've gone over.
        Α
            Yes.
21
            Did you understand those?
22
23
        Α
            Yes.
24
        0
            Do you think that they're fair?
25
        Α
            Yes, I do.
```

- Q Would you be able to enforce those them?
- 2 A Yes.

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

- 3 Q If the state met its burden?
- 4 A Yes.
- The concept of beyond a reasonable doubt which is the state's burden, any questions about that?
- 7 A No.
 - Q What does beyond a reasonable doubt mean to you?
 - A To me that means presenting evidence that shows that they are guilty but have no reason that you can say that they didn't do it because a rock fell off the roof, you know. That has nothing to do with the case so there's no reason to say it.
- They're not guilty because of that. It has to be pertinent to the case and to the evidence.
 - Q That is the doubt that you may have has to be pertinent proven to the case?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q And if it's based on reason, then you can find them 20 not guilty.
- 21 A Yes.
- Q But if it's unreasonable, you'd be able to set that aside.
- 24 A Yes.
- Q All right. Do you have anything in your background

282 1 or know anybody that's in law enforcement? Just some friends. 2 Α Anything about your friends, friendship with these 3 Q individuals that you believe would cause you to 4 have any biassed towards for law enforcement or 5 against law enforcement? 6 7 Α No. Anything that would effect your ability to be fair 8 Q and impartial? 9 10 Α No. Have you ever been the victim of a crime? 11 0 12 Α No. 13 Q Anybody in your family? 14 Α My mother. 15 Your mother. 0 16 Α Yeah. Anything particularly about that fact that she's 17 been a victim of a crime that you think would 18 19 effect you in this case? 2.0 А No. Anything that you think in your background would 21 0 make you a particularly good juror? 22 23 Just my ability to sort out facts because in my Α 24 work I have to sort out facts, and I don't go with

just one fact. I go for at least two or three or

- more to back up the first fact. I try not to base it on just one single thing.
 - Q And you're a truck mechanic?
- 4 A Yes.

5

6

7

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q What kinds of trucks do you work?
 - A Big trucks, semis, and school busses.
 - Q So somebody brings you a broken truck, and you have to basically diagnose the problem.
- 9 A Yes.
 - Q Do you ever find that the -- your first thought maybe isn't the reason why it broke down?
- 12 A Yes.
 - Q Describe and explain that to me; give me an example.
 - A One example is truck comes in, has a misfire, okay, you think you got a bad injector. You replace the injector, but the problem is that the injector broke the hole in the piston but if you don't keep looking through, you just put the one ejector on and you still (inaudible) because you have a hole in the piston. You continue your diagnosis and go to the end to find out the whole problem.
 - Q So you have to collect facts and then ultimately come to a conclusion based on those facts.
- 25 A Yes.

- Q Do you think you could do that in this case?
- A Yes.

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

Q Anything you think I need to know about your background, your experience, life experience that comes to mind that you think I should know about?

6 A No.

MR. WILLIAMS: No further questions, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Zook.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. ZOOK:

- Q So, Mr. Stull, if this case were about truck problems and the state showed that there was misfire and tried to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt that it was the injector, you would insist that for you to find beyond a reasonable doubt that it was the injector you'd have to know something about the condition of the piston.
- 19 A Yes.
 - Q Okay. I need to ask you this because I forgot to ask the last person. Can you give the defendants the presumption of being innocent at this time and through the trial?
- 24 A Yes.
- Q Okay. Thanks.

THE COURT: Mr. Crawford.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. CRAWFORD:

2.0

- Q Mr. Stull, anything going on at home right now that would make it difficult for you to give this case your undivided attention for the next couple of days?
- A There is one thing. My dad had a liver transplant, my mom had cornea transplant rejection, there's a family reunion coming up this weekend that they planned on going to for months so I would like to get them there. And if I didn't go past Friday, it wouldn't be a problem; but if it did, it would be a big problem.

THE COURT: This is not going to go past Friday because we have another case Monday. So we're going to stay if we stay all night. We're going to finish it.

Does that simplify things?

- A No. Because I'm leaving for Wisconsin at one o'clock Saturday morning.
- Q You'll be fine. Hopefully. The -- you mention that there was some -- was it your mother that was victim of a crime?
- A Yes.
 - Q Did that case get dealt with, or what specifically

happened with that? 1 It hasn't been dealt with yet. It's still going 2 Α 3 through the process whether they're going to prosecute the person or not. 4 5 Okay. Does the fact that this case involves an elderly lady, 94 years of age, would that cause you 6 7 some trouble in this case specifically dealing with the facts in this because of the situation with 8 9 your mother? 10 Α No. You can separate that and just decide the facts 11 Q 12 based solely upon what you hear over the next 13 couple of days? 14 Α Yes. Thank you. No further questions. 15 0 16 (Counsel approached the bench.) 17 THE COURT: Ms. Becker, does the state accept the jury and two alternates? 18 19 MS. BECKER: Yes, your Honor, we do. 2.0 THE COURT: Mr. Zook, does the defendant Ms. Canen accept the jury and two alternates? 21 MR. ZOOK: We do. 22 23 THE COURT: And, Mr. Crawford, does the 24 defendant Mr. Royer accept the jury and two alternates? 25 MR. CRAWFORD: We do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Those of you seated in the jury box, at this time I want you to stand up, please, face me, and raise your right hand.

(The jury was sworn an impaneled.)

THE COURT: Be seated. Those of you seated in the audience section, I want to thank you for your patience here today. It appears we have selected a jury and two alternates to try this case. We will count this as your jury service. You will not have to serve for a period of two years unless you choose to serve. If for some reason you want to come back, we will accommodate you. We have lots of jury trials in this court, and we will do our best to accommodate you. You're free to go. I thank you for your patience.

Those of you remaining in the jury box I wanted to give you kind of a road map on what you may expect here. We're going to let you go for the day. It's been a long day. I appreciate very much your patience. First thing we'll do is admonish you just as we have every other time when you left the courtroom. We're going rearrange your seating as I told you. Those of you seated on the left end will be on the right end in the same row you're in right now. Everyone else will move back to your original seat.

In the morning, I want you here at 8:15. At

8:30 we're going to bring you into the courtroom. The Court is going to give each of you a set of preliminary instructions on the law. I will read those preliminary instructions. We'll then hear the formal opening statements of counsel which will be kind of roadmap what they expect the evidence to show. That will be followed by the commencement of the presentation of evidence.

2.0

We should expect a day tomorrow probably ending in the neighborhood of 5:00 o'clock, 4:30, something like that. Wednesday we anticipate, perhaps, the possibility of a longer day. So you should make whatever arrangements you need to make. Anybody have any questions? All right. We're going let you go.

Before I let you go, I need to remind you one more time, you are all prospective jurors in this case. You are prohibited from discussing this case with anyone prior to the commencement of the evidentiary portion of the trial. To do so may result in a mistrial. After the presentation of evidence has begun, jurors may discuss the evidence presented amongst themselves in the jury room during recesses. All regular juror and alternates must be present during such discussion. You must reserve judgement concerning the outcome of the case until jury deliberations begin.

You may not discuss the facts of this case with

me or with the lawyers or with any of the witnesses.

You may not investigate the case yourselves or attempt to obtain any information outside the courtroom. It is highly improper for you to do so. You are also prohibited from reading any newspaper accounts of this case and from listening to or watching any radio or television reports relating to this trial. You are to consider and decide this case only upon the evidence received during the course of the trial here in the courtroom. We'll see you in the morning. Have a good evening.

(No further proceedings were had in this matter on this date.)

TUESDAY, AUGUST 9, 2005 1 (The Court convened with all the 2 3 parties present.) THE COURT: State of Indiana versus Andrew 4 Royer, State of Indiana versus Lana Canen 03-MR-155, 5 04-MR-118. Each defendant appears with their respective 6 7 counsel, counsel for the State of Indiana appears. Jury has been selected. We've made one adjustment in 8 9 preliminary instruction No. 2. It was at the suggestion 10 of counsel. Are you satisfied with that Mr. Zook and Mr. Crawford, and Ms. Becker? 11 MR. ZOOK: Yes, Your Honor. 12 13 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, your Honor. 14 MS. BECKER: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: All right. We're ready to bring 15 16 the jury in. We'll give them a copy of the preliminary 17 instructions. The Court will read the preliminary instructions. We'll go to you, Ms. Becker, then for 18 commencement of opening statement. 19 2.0 MR. ZOOK: Your Honor, I would like to take up this matter of 404(B) notice that state provided. I was 21 not here Thursday when apparently the Court was going to 22 23 consider that. 24 THE COURT: We reset it because you weren't 25 here. Is it something that we can do at the next recess?

```
MS. BECKER: No evidence involving 404(B) is
 1
      going to come in until after the next recess.
 2
 3
                MR. ZOOK: That's fine.
                THE COURT: Take it up then.
 4
                     (The jury entered the courtroom, and
                     the following proceedings were had.)
 6
 7
                THE COURT: Be seated, please. Good morning
      ladies and gentlemen, as I indicated to you yesterday,
 8
      we're going to commence the trial today with preliminary
 9
10
      instructions. The bailiff will furnish each of you with
      a copy of preliminary instructions. She'll also furnish
11
12
      you with a pen and a pad of paper. We'll address the
13
      note taking later when we read the instructions to you.
14
      The short version would be pay attention to the evidence
      as it is presented and do not let the act of taking notes
15
16
      distract you from evidence as it is being presented.
17
      Your notes will also become a part of the record. We're
      also going to furnish you with a with a jury question
18
19
      form. That will be addressed in the instructions also.
2.0
                Ladies and gentlemen, you are to consider all
      the instructions that are given to you as a whole and you
21
22
      are to regard each with the others given to you.
23
                Do not single out any certain instruction,
24
      sentence, or any individual point and ignore the others.
25
                For trial today is a criminal case brought by
```

the state of Indiana against Andrew M. Royer and Lana R. Canen. The case was commenced when an information was filed charging the defendants with murder, a felony. That information, omitting formal parts, reads as follows:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

"The undersigned affiant swears that on or about the 28 day of November, 2002, at the county of Elkhart, state of Indiana, one Andrew M. Royer and one Lana R. Canen, and they and each of them, did knowingly kill one Helen Sailor, another human being, by strangling the said Helen Sailor, while committing robbery, and as a direct and proximate result of the strangling as aforesaid, the said Helen Sailor was fatally wounded, and the said Helen Sailor did languish and die in said County and state on the 28th day of November, 2002; all of which is contrary to the form of Indiana Code section 35-42-1-1; contrary to the form of the statute in such cases made and provided; and, against the peace and dignity of the State of Indiana.

To this information the defendants have entered pleas of not guilty.

Upon the issues thus joined, the burden rests upon the State of Indiana to prove to each of you, beyond

a reasonable doubt, every essential element of the charges contained in the information or of any offense included therein.

2.0

The information which has been filed against the defendants is merely the formal method of charging the, and the charges must be proven by the evidence introduced during this trial.

The statute defining the offense of murder which was in force in Indiana at the time of the offense charged reads (in pertinent part) as follows:

"A person who kills another human being, while knowingly committing or attempting to commit robbery, commits felony murder, a felony."

The statute defining the offense of robbery which was in force in Indiana at the time of the offense officer charged reads (in pertinent part) as follows:

"A person who knowingly or intentionally takes property from another person or from the presence of another person;

- (1) by using or threatening the use of force on any person; or,
- (2) by putting any person in fear; commits robbery, a class C felony. However, the offense is a class B felony if it is committed while armed with a deadly weapon."

You should give separate consideration to each defendant. Each is entitled to have his or her case decided on the evidence and the law which is applicable to him or her.

2.0

Any evidence which is limited to one defendant should not be considered by you as to any other defendant.

You are entitled to draw all reasonable inferences that naturally and legitimately flow from the facts proven, and you are entitled to consider such inferences in reaching your verdict.

Knowingly is defined as: A person engages in conduct knowingly if, when he or she engages in the conduct, he or she is aware of high probability that he or she is doing so.

One or more of your members have asked if jurors are permitted to take notes during the course of the trial. You are, but having said that I must caution you that you should attend to all the evidence as it is presented and should not permit the act of taking notes to distract you. You should also understand that your notes must remain in the jury room when we separate, and that when the case is concluded, those notes will become a part of the court record.

Under the law, you must presume that both

defendants are innocent and you must continue to believe that they are innocent throughout the trial, unless the state proves that either defendant is guilty, beyond a reasonable doubt, of every essential element of the crime charged.

2.0

2.5

Since each defendant is presumed to be innocent, he or she is not required to present any evidence to prove his or her innocence, or to prove or explain anything. If, at the conclusion of the trial, there remains in your mind a reasonable doubt concerning the defendant's guilt, you must find him not guilty.

It is your responsibility as jurors to reach your verdict based solely upon the evidence presented in the trial. You are instructed that the filing of charges against the defendant, his or her arrest pursuant to such charges, and the fact that a defendant is here being tried in a court of law, is not evidence, and may not be considered, even in the slightest degree, as indicating his or her guilt.

The burden is upon the state to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that each defendant is guilty of the crime charged. It is a strict and heavy burden. The evidence must overcome any reasonable doubt concerning each defendant's guilt, but it does not mean that a defendant's guilt must be proved beyond all possible

doubt.

2.0

2.5

A reasonable doubt is a fair, actual, and logical doubt based upon reason and common sense. A reasonable doubt may arise either from the evidence or from a lack of evidence. Reasonable doubt exists when you are not firmly convinced of a defendant's guilt, after you've weighed and considered all of the evidence.

A defendant must not be convicted on suspicion or speculation. It is not enough for the state to show that the defendant is probably guilty. On the other hand, there are very few things in this world that we know with absolute certainty. The state does not have to overcome every possible doubt.

The state must prove each element of the crime by evidence that firmly convinces each of you and leaves no reasonable doubt. The proof must be so convincing that you can rely and act upon it in this matter of the highest importance.

If you find that there is a reasonable doubt that a defendant is guilty of the crime, you must give that defendant the benefit of that doubt and find that defendant not guilty of the crime under consideration.

While it is necessary that every essential element of the crime charged against the accused should be proven by the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, this

does not mean that all incidental facts must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

2.0

You must consider all of the evidence as a whole and must not single out any particular fact or circumstance.

A fact or circumstance considered apart from other evidence may be weak, if not improbable, but when viewed in connection with surrounding facts and circumstances, it may be so well supported as to remove all doubt as to its existence.

You are the exclusive judges of the evidence, the credibility of the witnesses, and of the weight to be given to the testimony of each of them. In considering the testimony of any witness, you may take into account their ability and opportunity to observe; their memory, manner, and conduct, while testifying; any interest, bias, or prejudice they may have; any relationship with other witnesses or interested parties; and the reasonableness of their testimony considered in the light of all the evidence in the case.

You should attempt to fit the evidence to the presumption that each defendant is innocent and to the theory that every witness is telling the truth. You should not disregard the testimony of any witness without a reason and without careful consideration. However, if

you find that the testimony of a witness is so unreasonable as to be unworthy of belief, or if you find so much conflict between the testimony of witnesses that you cannot believe all of them, then you must determine which of them you will believe and which of them you will disbelieve.

2.0

In weighing the testimony to determine what or whom you will believe, you should use your own knowledge, experience, and common sense gained from day-to-day living. You may find that the number of witnesses who testify to a particular fact or on one side or the other or the quantity of evidence on a particular point, does not control your determination of the truth. You should give the greatest weight to that evidence which convinces you most strongly of its truthfulness.

The trial of this case will proceed as follows:

First, the attorneys will have an opportunity

to make opening statements. These statements are not

evidence and should be considered by you as a preview of

what the attorneys expect the evidence will be.

Following the opening statements, witnesses will be called to testify. They will be placed under oath and questioned by the attorneys. Documents and other tangible exhibits may also be received as evidence.

When the evidence is completed, the attorneys

will make their final statements. These final statements are not evidence but are given to assist you in evaluating the evidence. The attorneys are also permitted to argue; to characterize the evidence and to attempt to persuade you to a particular verdict. You may accept of reject those arguments as you see fit.

2.0

2.5

Finally, just before you retire to consider your verdict, I will give you further instructions on the law which applies to this case.

During the trial certain exhibits may be offered in evidence. When admitted into evidence, each of you should carefully examine those exhibits, without discussion, at the time they are submitted to you.

Counsel will be given an opportunity to question all witnesses. When counsel have finished questioning the witnesses, if you feel there are substantial questions that should be asked, you will be given an opportunity to do so prior to that witness being excused. The way we handle juror questions is to require you to write out the question on the question form and sign legibly at the bottom. The bailiff or a member of the court staff will retrieve the question and provide it to counsel to review and give it to me. This method gives counsel for both sides and me the opportunity to review the questions before they are asked since your

questions, like questions of counsel, are subject to objection. I will ask the questions on your behalf if deemed appropriate. There are a couple of matters for you to consider concerning questions. First, you cannot attempt to help either side.

2.5

Second, counsel are trained attorneys and have spent much time preparing for this case. They know more about the case and the witnesses than we do. Very often they do not ask what may appear to us to be an obvious question because they are aware that a particular witness has no knowledge on that subject or the question may be objectionable and they already know that.

Third, Rules of Evidence control what can and cannot be received into evidence. As I indicated, questions of witnesses are subject to objection, so an objection may be made to your question and the Court may sustain that objection. Therefore, your question, while submitted, may not be answered. During the course of the trial when I sustain an objection, disregard the question and answer. If I overrule an objection, you may consider both the question and the answer.

During the course of the trial, if any of you realize that you have personal knowledge on any fact material to this case, you should inform the bailiff of this fact at the first recess or adjournment after you

become aware of such fact.

2.0

You are all jurors in this case, and I must tell you now and I will repeat this again each time you are permitted to separate.

Generally, you should not express any opinion about the case before it is submitted to you for deliberation; however, you are permitted to discuss the evidence presented in this case amongst yourselves in the jury room during recesses from trial. All jurors and alternates must be present during these discussions, and you must reserve judgment about the outcome of the case until your deliberations begin.

You are admonished that you may not discuss the facts of the case with anyone other than your fellow jurors.

You may not discuss this case with me or with the lawyers, parties or with any of the witnesses.

You should not listen to or read any outside or media accounts of the trial. You may not investigate the case or attempt to obtain information outside the courtroom. It is highly improper for you to do so. You are to consider and decide this case only upon the evidence received during the course of the trial in the courtroom.

The Court has read these preliminary

instructions to you prior to the opening statements of
the attorneys and prior to the introduction of the
evidence so that you may understand the issues presented
and the rules regarding the burden of proof, the
credibility of witnesses, and the weighing of evidence.

2.0

You will receive further instructions after you have heard all the evidence and final arguments.

Let's review one more time jury questions. If you have a question that you believe you want answered, you need to take your question form, write out the question, sign it at the bottom, get the attention of Ms. Jackson, the bailiff; Ann, the Court reporter or myself or one of the lawyers give us your question. It is important that you remember this. We must have your question before the witness leaves the courtroom. Once they've left the courtroom, we may not have any ability to get them back. Anybody have any questions about that procedure? Okay. If you have a question, you'll need to write your question out, get our attention, and then we'll address the issue raised in your question.

We're going to move into the opening statements now. As I told you in the instructions, these are not evidence. They're given to assist you in kind of a roadmap of how the attorneys expect the case will proceed. State has the burden of proof. For that

reason, the state will address you first. Mr. Williams will address you on behalf of the state.

2.0

OPENING STATEMENT

MR. WILLIAMS: May it please the Court,
Mr. Crawford, Mr. Zook. Ladies and gentlemen, this is a
case about the senseless killing of a 94-year-old woman
for money. On Thanksgiving day of 2002, the defendants,
Andrew Royer and Lana Canen, demanded money from 94 year
old Helen Sailor; and when she refused to give the
defendants money, she was killed, strangled to death by
Andrew Royer.

On Thanksgiving day of 2002, which was

November 28, Helen Sailor was 94 years old. She was in

relatively good health for a 94-year-old woman. She had

a few aliments. She had extremely poor eyesight, she was

hard of hearing, she had some trouble with her mobility,

and she used a walker to assist her. She was organized

and tidy. She had to be because of her poor eyesight so

the things in her apartment had to be in the proper

place.

She was a religious woman. She shared her religion with others, and she lived in apartment 1002 on the tenth floor of the Waterfall Highrise Apartment complex in the city of Elkhart here in Elkhart County.

Now, on Thanksgiving day of 2002, Helen had

Thanksgiving dinner with some of her relatives Larry and Carol Converse. Now, after dinner at about 5:30, the Converse's took Helen back to her apartment. When they arrived at around 5:30, Carol Converse walked Helen to the front door. Helen had with her, her walker and a bag of leftovers from Thanksgiving. Carol Converse gave Helen a kiss goodbye, watched her enter the door and walk towards the elevator of the apartment building. It was the last time anybody would see Helen Sailor alive other than the defendants.

2.0

Now, at about 8:45 that evening, Caroline
Hoffer, who was Helen's home care aide, attempted to call
Helen on the telephone. She wanted to tell Helen that
she was going to be over early the next morning on Friday
about 7:00 a.m. and because she was coming so early she
wanted to make sure Helen knew that. Caroline Hoffer
called approximately eight to ten times between 8:45 and
9:15. She didn't receive an answer. If Helen was home,
she usually answered the phone when the rang. This
caused some concern in Caroline Hoffer. Ultimately, she
decided, well, maybe Helen was out with relatives for
Thanksgiving.

So on Friday November 29, 7:00 a.m. Caroline
Hoffer was at Helen's door knocking, and she continued to
knock for a number of minutes. No answer. Now, Caroline

2.0

2.5

Hoffer didn't have a key to the door, and the door was locked, a door that you will learn only locks when you leave, and you lock the door from the outside. Now, Caroline Hoffer knew that the Converse's had a key to the apartment so she contacted them. Larry and Carol Converse came to the apartment building. They all went to up to Helen Sailor's apartment, and they unlocked the door. And when they entered the apartment, they saw that things were not as they normally were. A rug was out of place. A Bible that Helen kept in a box by her chair was laying on a hospital bed that was in the living room. There were two cranberry juice bottles that were empty that were in the sink not where they were supposed to be.

Helen's medication that she took, which was in a Tupperware box, pill box, it was not in its normal place. It was on the stove instead of being on the counter where it always was. Eventually, the Converses and Ms. Hoffer went into the bedroom, and it's there they found Helen laying on her back, her arm outstretched, her dentures out of her mouth and on the floor. She was dead.

911 was called, the police arrived. Helen's body was take to the Elkhart General Hospital where an autopsy was performed by Doctor Joseph Prahlow of the South Bend Medical Foundation. He determined that the

cause of death was asphyxiation by strangulation. The manner of death was homicide.

2.0

The Elkhart Police Department began an investigation into this murder. The detectives that were assigned interviewed people that lived at the apartment complex, they tracked down leads, but they didn't have any viable suspects, and so the case went cold, became a cold case. It wasn't until August of 2003 when Elkhart Police Department established its homicide unit that the investigation began again.

It was there when the homicide unit took over and looked over the evidence that two suspects emerged, Andrew Royer and Lana Canen. Now, Andrew Royer and Lana Canen both lived at the Waterfall Highrise Apartments.

Andrew Royer lived on the fifth floor. Lana Canen lived on the eight floor. Royer and Canen were friends. They were seen together all the time. You will learn that Andrew Royer isn't that mentally sophisticated; and with respect to his relationship with Lana Canen, she had the ability to manipulate Andrew Royer.

In early September of 2003, Andrew Royer gave a statement to Detective Carl Conway of the Elkhart Police Department. In that statement, he admitted that he strangled Helen Sailor to death. He gave intimate details about the crime scene and the killing. It was

backed up by evidence collected by the Elkhart Police

Department. When asked by Detective Conway why he killed

Helen Sailor, he said, "It was a money thing, and she

just happened to be the victim." A senseless killing for

money.

With respect to the Lana Canen, she was interviewed by the police early in the investigation after the murder and also in September of 2003. She gave statements not only to the police, but to witnesses. Those statements were inconsistent. She told the police and witnesses things that could not possibly be true. She implicated herself in this felony murder.

with regard to this crime, the planning and execution of the robbery and the subsequent attempts to cover up the killing, it was a mentally intellectually sophisticated event. You will learn that Andrew Royer did not have the mental sophistication to plan and execute this robbery alone, nor did he have the mental sophistication to do the things that were done to try to cover up the killing. You will learn that Lana Canen did have that mental sophistication. With respect to the planning and execution of the robbery and the attempts to cover up the killing, it was Lana Canen that was the brains, the mastermind. Andrew Royer was the brawn.

Now, you have heard and you know that the

defendants have been charged with felony murder. With respect to Andrew Royer, he physically killed Helen Sailor during the commission of the robbery. With respect to Lane Canen, she was his accomplice in the felony murder. She aided, induced, or caused Andrew Royer to commit this felony murder, that it was Lana Canen with respect to the planning of this crime who is responsible. She was there for the execution of the robbery, and ultimately assisted in the cleaning up of attempts to cover up this homicide.

2.0

2.5

Now, at the close of evidence after you've seen all the exhibits you've heard from all the witnesses, myself and Ms. Becker will have an opportunity to come back and speak with you again. At that time you will know that this was a senseless killing of a 94-year-old year woman for money, and we will ask that you find the defendants, Andrew Royer and Lana Canen, guilty of felony murder.

THE COURT: Counsel for the defendant, Mr. Zook for Ms. Canen.

OPENING STATEMENT

MR. ZOOK: Good morning. I represent Lana

Canen. I don't represent Mr. Royer. He's in capable

hands. I'll have to tell you Indiana's system is a

little odd. I can't make an opening statement when it's

my turn to open my case. I have to do it now. It's supposed to be a preview of coming attractions. What I anticipate seeing is a lot of proof coming out of the state's hands. They have kind of outlined that proof for you.

2.5

And what -- I'm going to tease you a little bit here. What I want you to do is please watch that proof very carefully with an eye toward the timing of the events as they come in because later on when it comes time to sum up the case, the state will talk to you, and I will have a chance, and the other defense attorney will have a chance, and that may play a critical role for you. And if you don't remember it or if it doesn't seem important when you watch it come in, you may not understand what we're talking about. But it is important. It's so important, ladies and gentlemen, that when you go back and deliberate you'll find Lana Canen not guilty. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Crawford, for the defendant Mr. Royer.

MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you, your Honor.

OPENING STATEMENT

MR. CRAWFORD: May it please the Court, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, prosecution. On November 28, 2002 Helen Sailor died. It was at that point in time and

thereafter that the police investigation commenced. You will learn from the testimony from the State of Indiana that a number of officers were involved in this case, and a number of officers talked to individuals at the Waterfall Highrise thereafter.

2.0

It was an extensive period of time when these officers spoke with all the residents and the residents at the Highrise began to speak about the events that occurred on November 28, 2002. You will later learn as you have already heard from the State of Indiana that my client, Mr. Royer, was, in fact, questioned by Detective Carl Conway from the Elkhart Police Department on September 3 of 2003, almost ten months or so after this incident had taken place.

You will also learn that my client, like

Ms. Canen, was also a resident of the Waterfall Highrise
and also was privy to the conversations that had

transpired in the highrise after the events had taken

place in this case. Again, I caution you when you listen
to the testimony and to the information concerning the

confession that you keep in mind the issues concerning
the mentality of Mr. Royer. I ask you to keep those in

mind and carefully consider those when you listen to the
events that transpire later during the course of this

trial.

Again, this was an event that occurred on November 28, 2002. The conversations with Detective Carl Conway occurred on September 3 of 2003. And I would ask you to keep in mind too the time sequence. Mr. Zook made representations of the issues concerning time sequences. But importantly in regard to that, I ask you to take into account and to keep in mind that Mr. Royer went into the police station at approximately 9:30 that morning and the statement occurred later in the afternoon. I ask you to keep that in mind when you carefully consider what you hear and specifically what you hear in that statement as well too.

2.0

2.5

And, finally, like everyone has asked you to do, I ask you to carefully listen the testimony and the statements of the individuals as they come up before you in the witness stand over the next couple of days. While all of them may not have everything critical to this case, there are pieces of information that you can gather and you can discern from that, and you can carefully look at when you assess the overall scope of a case.

I believe that once you listen to all the testimony in this case and carefully consider every piece of testimony including the things that you may hear concerning Mr. Royer, you take that back, and I believe that after that you will find Mr. Royer not guilty.

```
Thank you.
 1
 2
                THE COURT: Call your first witness.
 3
                MS. BECKER: Thank you, Judge.
                MR. WILLIAMS: State would call Caroline
 4
      Hoffer.
 5
                THE COURT: Would you raise your right hand,
 6
 7
      please?
                     (The witness was sworn.)
 8
                THE WITNESS: I do.
 9
10
                THE COURT: Take the witness stand, please.
                           CAROLINE HOFFER
11
12
      called on behalf of the State, having been first duly
13
      sworn, testified as follows:
14
                         DIRECT EXAMINATION
      BY MR. WILLIAMS:
15
            Would you please introduce yourself to the jury?
16
17
        Α
            My name is Caroline Hoffer.
                MR. ZOOK: Your Honor, excuse me. We ask that
18
      the witnesses be separated.
19
2.0
                THE COURT: State's position on that?
                MS. BECKER: No objection, your Honor.
21
      Detective Daggy would be our representative.
22
23
                THE COURT: All right. Detective Daggy will be
24
      the state's representative. Ladies and gentlemen in the
      audience section, if any of you are witnesses or know
25
```

- USDC IN/ND case 3:14-cv-00315-RL document 42-4 filed 09/10/15 page 314 of 802 yourself to be witnesses, you'll have to leave the 1 courtroom at this time. Motion for separation is granted 2 3 without objection. BY MR. WILLIAMS: 4 Would you spell your last name for the court reporter? 6 H-o-f-f-e-r. 7 Α And where do you reside? 8 0 Elkhart, Indiana. 9 Α 10 0 What's your occupation? I'm a certified nursing assistant/home health aide. 11 12 Q And where are do you work? 13 Α Currently I'm working in Cass County Medical Care Facility in Cassopolis, Michigan. 14 Now, where did you work in November of 2002? 15 0 I worked here in Elkhart up in Elkhart at Regional 16 Α 17 Home Health Care. And what is Regional Home Health Care? 18
 - Regional is a company that provides home health Α aides to go to client's homes to provide activities of daily living, which would be bathing, washing, laundry, some shopping, cooking, cleaning.
 - And how long did you work for them?
 - Α And started September of that year.
- So as of November 28, 2003 --25 0

2.0

21

22

23

- A Three months.
- Q Three months?
- 3 A Yes.

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q As of November 28, 2002, you were working for --
- 5 A -- Regional Home Health Care.
 - Q What's your educational background to be a home health nurse?
 - A Regional required the certified nurse's assistant license which means you have 40 hours of classroom and then 72 to 75 hours of clinical.
 - Q Do you receive any training when you start a job?
 - A Really the only kind of training you get is what they would like you to do and it's like per client, you know, for this client you have to do this, and for this one you have to do maybe, you know, something, you know, laundry in one place and, you know, cooking for another. But training, they make sure you know the CPR and basic first aide things
 - Q So you touched on this a little bit but the job responsibilities that you would have, could you describe those for the jury?

but training per say, no.

A Well, the typical client I would go in and if they were not out of bed, I would get them out of be.

didn't, if they just had one the day before, you know, we wouldn't shower them or bathe them, would get them dressed. Some of them I would cook them breakfast.

If I was there -- depending how long you were there, sometimes we were there for two hours, four hours, eight. If it was a two-hour gig, you would do the getting them up in the morning, wash them, bathe them, feed them. You may vacuum, you may dust, straighten up the place. And some places we would then -- we would do all that, and then maybe go to the laundry mat. Take their laundry to the laundry mat and do that for them.

- Q Now, did you have a patient by the name of Helen Sailor?
- A Yes, I did.

- Q How long did you have her as a patient?
- A I started out, I believe, caring for her in

 September, and I had her the whole three months I

 was there.
 - Q Through November 28.
- 22 A Through November 28, yes.
- Q Do you know how old she was?
- 24 A Yes, she was 94.
 - Q Why did you have that reaction about her being 94?

- A My first or second visit there we were just sitting and visiting. We'd done everything that I needed to do with her. She'd had her shower; she was dressed. And she says, "How old do you think, I am?" I said, "Oh, I hate that question, Helen."

 You know you don't ask a woman hold they are, and I just didn't want to guess, and I said 82 is my pretty pat answer, and she says, "I'm 94." I said, "Wow, you look pretty good for 94."
- Q Did you have a specific schedule for Helen?
- A I was there generally three days a week.
 - Q And how much time during the day did you spend with her?
 - A Two of those days would be two hours, and one of those days it would be four years. That was when we would go down into the basement of the highrise and do her laundry.
 - Q Now, you said something about the highrise. Where did she live?
 - A The highrise on Waterfall Drive in Elkhart.
- Q And was that located obviously in Elkhart, but was that in Elkhart County, State of Indiana?
- 23 A Yes.

Q Now, how many times had you -- had you been in her apartment from the time you started your care with

317 her from the time you ended your care? 1 2 Α How many times from September to November? 3 Q Yes. Oh, gosh. I'd need a calculator for that. 4 Α An estimation would be fine. 5 Q Estimation. Three times a week for three months, 6 Α 7 12 times a month, times three, 36. So approximately 36 times, somewhere in that area? 0 8 9 Α Somewhere in that ball park, yes. 10 Q Were you Helen's only home care nurse? No. Angel -- I had coworker named Angel. You want 11 Α her last name? 12 13 Q I don't know. If you know it, yeah. 14Α Angel Noe N-o-e. Did she do the same type of thing that you did? 15 0 16 Yes, yes. Α 17 Where respect to Helen, you talked about your general duties for a patient. What did you do for 18 Helen, specifically for her? Specifically, 19 20 showered her, helped her get dressed, pour her -her cranberry juice. She had a specific amount of 21 cranberry juice she wanted to drink everyday. If I 22 23 didn't do her laundry, I would vacuum the carpet 24 that's in one room, wet mop the bathroom, clean the

bathroom when we were was done in the shower, mop

```
the bathroom floor, make sure the kitchen was tidy.
 1
            There was really very little to do in the kitchen
 2
 3
            other than, you know, I would rinse out the glass
            that she used if she was done with it, and we'd sit
 4
            and visit.
                MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, may I approach?
 6
 7
                THE COURT: You may.
            I'm handing you what's been marked as State's
        0
 8
 9
            Exhibit 1 for identification. Do you recognize
10
            that.
            Yes, I do.
11
12
            And what is it a photo of?
13
        Α
            This is photo of Helen Sailor when she was alive.
14
            Does it fairly and accurately depict what Helen
            looked like on November 28 or as of November 28 of
15
16
            2002?
17
        Α
           Yes, it does.
                MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, the state moves to admit
18
      State's Exhibit 1.
19
2.0
                THE COURT: Mr. Crawford.
                MR. CRAWFORD: No objection, your Honor.
21
                THE COURT: Mr. Zook.
22
23
                MR. ZOOK: No objection.
24
                MR. WILLIAMS: At this time the state would
25
      move to publish State's Exhibit 1 to the jury.
```

```
THE COURT: Well, let's see if we get it
 1
      admitted first. State's Exhibit 1 will be admitted
 2
 3
      without object. The request for publication.
                MR. ZOOK: No objection.
 4
 5
                MR. CRAWFORD: No objection.
                THE COURT: And Exhibit 1 will be published
 6
 7
      without objection. You're going to publish by passing
      it?
 8
                MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, your Honor.
 9
10
                THE COURT: You may do so.
                     (State's Exhibit 1 was published to
11
12
                     the jury.)
13
      BY MR. WILLIAMS:
            Let's talk a little bit about Helen Sailor. What
14
            was her personality?
15
16
            She was very warm, friendly, open.
        Α
17
        Q
            Was she religious?
            Oh, mercy yes.
18
        Α
19
        Q
            Why do you say that?
20
        Α
            I knew -- we -- she asked me if I was a Christian,
            and I said, yes, I am. And she said, well, I go to
21
            church every Sunday, and we would just talk about
22
23
            how we felt -- how our faith was, how strong our
24
            faith was. We would pray, or she would pray for
25
            me.
```

- Q She would share her religion with you then.
- 2 A Yes, she did.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q Did she have any ailments, or what was her medical condition?
 - A She had diabetes and a heart condition. That was all I knew. As aids, we only did the care, and we kind of just knew the basics.
 - Q What about her sight?
- A She couldn't see very well.
- Q And why do you say that?
- A You can -- you can tell when someone's eyes, you know, when you've been doing it for a while, you can just see; and she -- the way she walked. She knew where everything was in her apartment so she didn't have to, you know, try to grab for things as she was walking, but -- and she said, you know, I don't see very well.
 - Q You said that you -- she had -- she knew where everything was in her apartment. Was she organized?
- 21 A Extremely organized.
- 22 Q Was that because of the sight problem?
- 23 A Yes.
- Q What about hearing? Do you remember her having an hearing problems?

- A She did have a hard time hearing, and she was supposed to wear hearing aides and didn't like the.

 They hurt her ears.
- Q What about her mobility?

2.0

- A She was slow, but she could walk.
- Q Did she have anything that assisted her?
 - A She used a walker when she left the apartment.
 - Q When she was in the apartment, where would the walker be?
 - A The walker was in -- there's a bedroom area and it had a dresser and then the bathroom was back in the corner of the closet. The walker always sat in that room near her closet.
 - Q Well, let's talk about apartment. You come to the door of her apartment. Describe for the jury what you see when you go into her apartment. Give them a layout.
 - When you first walk in, you have a pantry closet on your left, and right there right inside the door and the kitchen -- there was a refrigerator, sink, stove and a little hunk of counter on the right cabinet or just a few cabinets, and then in that same room but a bigger -- little bit bigger section because it would angle off to the left, she had a table. There was a hospital bed along the wall all

the way up to the window. The windows were straight ahead. Doorway into a bedroom. Just past that doorway in that same room was her little table where she had her stuff, where she would put things and her recliner, and the TV was right next to her recliner. She could -- she liked to have to see the TV out of this one eye. If she got really close, she could see some images on the TV; and it was loud if she had it on, and another little table just with things. She would keep things.

The other room that you would go into had a double bed along the left wall, a little aisle way, and then a dresser across from that bed, then back this way empty space, the walker, a clothes closet and then the bathroom.

- Q Is it a small apartment?
- 17 A Yes.

- 18 Q One bedroom?
- 19 A Technically, I suppose you could call it one 20 bedroom.
 - Q Because she kept this hospital bed in the living room.
- 23 A Right.
 - Q Now, did Helen take any medication?
- THE COURT: Excuse me, Counsel, approach,

```
1
      please.
                      (An off-the-record discussion was held
 2
 3
                     at the bench.)
                THE COURT: Proceed, please.
 4
      BY MR. WILLIAMS:
 5
            I was talking about medications. Did she take
 6
 7
            medications?
           Yes, she did.
        Α
 8
 9
            Were you responsible for her medication?
10
        Α
            No.
            Who dispensed the medication?
11
        Q
12
        Α
            The nurses from home health care would come in and
13
            fill her pill bottles like once a week or once
14
            every two weeks. I don't know. I had nothing to
            do with her pills, so I don't know.
15
16
            Did you know where her medication was located?
17
        Α
            It was kept in a container on a little piece of
            countertop next to her stove.
18
            What was the container made out of?
19
        Q
            It was a clear plastic like a rubber made box.
20
        Α
        0
            And you said on the countertop. Where was the
21
            counter top in the kitchen?
22
23
            Just to the left of the stove.
        Α
24
        0
            Did you ever touch the medication?
            No. I may have touched it if a wiped the
25
```

- countertop, you know, to lift it up and wipe 1 underneath it. That was all. 2 I want to talk to you about the week of 3 Q Thanksgiving of 2002. Do you recall when you 4 saw -- when the last time was that you saw Helen 5 before Thanksgiving? 6 I was there on Wednesday before Thanksgiving and 7 Α did her care. 8
 - Q Do you remember what you did for her?
- 10 A Showered her, dressed her. I don't remember if I
 11 did her laundry.
 - Q Did you see her on Thanksgiving?
- 13 A No.

12

19

20

21

22

23

- 14 Q Why is that?
- A She denied care for Thanksgiving. She wanted the aides to be able to be home with their families.

 So she told Regional don't send anyone over. I want them home.
 - Q Did you attempt to contact her on Thanksqiving?
 - A Yes. Our policy was the night before we go to any client, we would call them to remind them that we were coming and what time we were coming.
 - Q What time were you going the next day?
 - A I was to be there at seven in the morning.
- Q Describe what you did in your attempts to contact

Helen?

- I started calling her about 8:45, got no response.

 I called I don't know how many times, eight to ten times at least between 8:45 and 9:15. And in getting no response our -- what we're supposed to do is call the nurse on call. I did that, and she said she's probably still out with her family, and I said I don't think so. It's just unusual for her to be out this late. I don't feel right. What should I do? Do you want me to go over there? And she said, no. Just give her a call in the morning before you go.
- Q Let's go to the next day, which is Friday, November 29. Describe what you did?
- A Woke up and got ready for work, and I made the phone call in the morning probably around 6:30, and no response again. So I drove over there, and in order to get into the building you have to buzz a buzzer in the foyer and then the resident opens the lock from there apartment. And buzzed it a couple times, two times, and got no response, and there was a man in the -- I don't know what you call it -- inside the door that I knew from being in there all the times I was in there, and I said, could you open the door and let me in, and he knew

me so he let me in, and I went right up to her 1 apartment and started ringing the doorbell and got 2 3 no response. This was five till seven when I got up to her apartment door. 4 Now, did she have a buzzer or did you knock? 5 Q I would knock. 6 Α 7 How long did you knock? Q I knocked for eight minutes; eight to ten minutes I Α 8 9 stood knocking. 10 Q Was the door open? And I also called with my cell phone. I could hear 11 12 the phone ringing, and the door was not -- the door 13 was locked. How -- describe the lock on the door? 14 It was deadbolt lock. 15 Α 16 How would -- how would you lock the door? Q Twist -- twist lock from the inside. 17 Α If you were leaving, would you have to lock it from 18 0 the outside, do you know? 19 20 Α You could lock it from the outside if you had a key. 21 All right. Now, you were knocking for eight to ten 22 23 minutes, got no answer, called on your cell phone. 24 What did you do next? 25 I knew the lady that lived across the hall, so I

went to her door, and she came to the door, and I 1 asked her if she would happened to have Helen's 2 3 cousin's phone number because I needed to get into the apartment and she did. 4 Did you know her cousin? 5 Q I had seen them a couple of times. 6 Α 7 Do you know who they were, their names? Q Larry and Carol Converse. Α 8 Did they come to the apartment? 9 Q They came immediately. They were there within ten, 10 Α 15 minutes. 11 12 Describe what happened after the Converses arrived? 13 Α Larry opened up the door and went in the apartment, 14 and he says, "I found her. She's in here," and I immediately stepped around him cause he kind of 15 backed off and saw where she was. 16 17 0 Describe what you saw? With her? 18 Α 19 Q Yes. 20

A She was laying on her back, her right arm was extended out flat palm up, her teeth were on the floor, a little -- maybe a foot from her fingertips her lower plate, and her face was really dark modeled purplish reddish. She was swollen. Her body seemed swollen. She was a bigger woman, but

21

22

23

24

she swollen.

Her pants were -- her slacks were down around her knees. She had a brief and her underwear on. Her blouse was pulled up to her breasts, and I just -- I knew she was gone, and I just -- I just only had taken one step into the room and saw the condition of the room and stepped back, and I called 911.

- Q You mentioned Helen's teeth. Did she wear dentures?
- A She wore dentures, yes.
 - Q Both upper and lower?
- 13 A Yes.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

- Q Did Helen ever wear anything around the beck?
 - A She wore what is called a lifeline. It's a black cloth cord with a little cream colored -- I think cream colored box that if they fell they could just grab that, and it wouldn't take much to push, and they would then get a call from a company asking them if they were all right, and did they need assistance.
 - Q You said there was a call button on this black cord.
- 24 A Yes.
- Q Was anything else on this lanyard? Was it just the

lifeline?

- A There was something else hanging there. I can't recall what it was.
- Q Now, did you notice anything out of place in the apartment?
- A Yes. When I first walked, I noticed she had a carpet that went from the counter -- may I have a glass of water, please.
- Q Absolutely.
- A She had a carpet that spanned the area between her counter and her pantry. And when I first walked in, I noticed that it was just a -- cockeyed, which would not be how she would have it because if it was not straight she could trip over it. That was not right. There were two jugs of empty cranberry juice in the sink which was not right as well. If she were to empty one, it would be put in the trash. Things were just put away.

On her chair -- she did not sleep in either of the beds. She slept in her recliner, and she always kept a black Hefty bag on the chair because she would have accidents and a towel over that.

That was not there. So there were things on top of the hospital bed, and there was never anything on there except like stuffed animals, a few stuffed

animals along the wall.

Her Bible was on that bed, which was always in the wooden shelf by her chair. When I stepped into the room where she was, I just took one step; and I looked to the left, and I saw drawers on the -- the place had definitely been gone through. There were two drawers out of her dresser, and they were on bed and the contents were out. There was a box kind of half out from under the bed that was a red box that had a lock that was off to the side. And I looked to the right not knowing if whoever had done this was still there and didn't see anything in the bathroom.

- Q Did you notice anything about her walker?
- A Her walker was in the living room, and it was always in that other room.
- 17 Q Did Helen have a key chain?
- 18 A Yes.

- 19 Q Can you describe the key chain?
- 20 A It had a heart on it, and her apartment key and a
 21 few other keys. I'm not sure what the keys went
 22 to.
 - Q Do you recall seeing that key chain when you were in there --
 - A That was on her kitchen table. That was always

where she left it. 1 Were there any keys on the key ring? 2 3 Α I don't remember. After you found the body, you called 911. 4 5 Α Yes. And were you eventually interviewed by the police? 6 7 Α Yes. MR. WILLIAMS: One moment, your Honor. No 8 further questions, Judge. 9 10 THE COURT: Mr. Zook. MR. ZOOK: No questions. 11 THE COURT: And Mr. Crawford. 12 13 MR. CRAWFORD: Just briefly, your Honor. Thank 14 you. 15 CROSS-EXAMINATION 16 BY MR. CRAWFORD: 17 Ms. Hoffer, you mentioned that you called between 8:45 and 9:15. Is that correct? 18 19 A Yes. 20 Q And you mentioned that this was a common practice for you. Is that correct? 21 22 Yes. 23 All the other times that you had called during the 24 period of your assistance with Helen did she 25 answer?

- 1 A Yes.
- Q Was it relatively -- was that something that you normally did call about 8:45?
- 4 A No. I called later because we had just gotten home from our Thanksqiving dinner.
- Q Had you ever called that late before in the past,
 to your knowledge?
- A I usually tried to call between seven and eight o'clock at night.
- 10 Q And Helen would always answer those calls.
- 11 A Yes.
- Q When you would go over and take care of her, how often -- you mentioned that you went three days a week. Is that correct?
- 15 A Yes.
- Q And how often -- how long would you stay when you visited with Helen?
- A For normal care, two hours. One day a week we would spend four hours there.
- 20 Q At about what time would you get over there?
- 21 A Generally at eight, eight to ten or eight to noon.
- Q Okay. You mentioned that you knew the lady across
 the street. Is that correct?
- 24 A Yes.
- Q Do you know if she was a friend of Helen's?

- A Yes, she was.
- Q Were there other people that came like the lady across the way that were friends of Helen's while you were taking care of her?
- 5 A No.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

- Q Your only connection was the lady across the way?
- A That I knew her well enough. I knew she knew people that were down in the lobby because they would all say Hi to her so they all knew her. But as far as right there at her room, Mary Jane was the only one that I knew that had come because she had come in when I would be giving care sometimes.
- Q To your knowledge, how many people are on the floor on the tenth floor?
- 15 A I would not know that.
- Q Okay. More than, obviously, Ms. Sailor. Is that correct?
- 18 A Oh, certainly.
- 19 Q More than five?
- 20 A Oh, certainly.
- 21 Q And the lady across the street, what was her name?
- 22 A Marry Jane. I don't know her last name.
- Q And she's the only one you encountered on that floor.
- 25 A Yes.

```
MR. CRAWFORD: No further questions, your
 1
      Honor.
 2
                THE COURT: Mr. Williams, any additional
 3
      questions?
 4
 5
                MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor.
                THE COURT: Mr. Zook, any additional questions?
 6
 7
                MR. ZOOK: No, sir.
                THE COURT: You may step down. Watch your
 8
      step. Call your next witness.
 9
                MS. BECKER: Can this witness be released from
10
      her subpoena?
11
12
                THE COURT: Any reason she cannot be released?
13
                MR. ZOOK: No.
14
                MR. CRAWFORD: No.
15
                THE COURT: She'll be released from her
16
      subpoena.
17
                MS. BECKER: Thank you, your Honor.
                THE COURT: Would you raise your right hand,
18
19
      please.
2.0
                     (The witness was sworn.)
21
                THE WITNESS: I do.
                THE COURT: Take the witness stand, please.
22
23
      1///
     1111
24
      1111
2.5
```

1		CAROL CONVERSE
2	calle	d on behalf of the State, having been first duly
3	sworn	, testified as follows:
4		DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY MR	. WILLIAMS:
6	Q	Would you please introduce yourself to the jury?
7	A	I'm Carol Converse. I was Helen Sailor's second
8		cousin.
9	Q	And where do you live?
10	A	In Elkhart.
11	Q	Are you married?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	Who are you married to?
14	A	Larry Converse.
15	Q	Now, did you know Helen Sailor when she was alive?
16	А	Yes.
17	Q	You said your relationship was you were second
18		cousins.
19	A	Actually, she was my husband's second cousin.
20	Q	So it was Larry's second cousin.
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	Did you ever see Helen?
23	A	Constantly.
24	Q	Describe your contact with her?
25	A	We were like caregivers for her. We would go over

once a weak, take food. I'd go to the grocery 1 store for her. She'd come over and visit with our 2 3 family. She loved our kids and our grandchildren. So she was over at least once a month. We would go 4 camping during the summer. We'd take her down 5 there for a day so that she could enjoy the 6 7 outdoors. We were just with her quite a bit. Where did she live? 0 8 9 Α In the highrise on Waterfall. 10 0 Had she always lived in that apartment? She moved back from Georgia, and she'd lived 11 Α 12 in Georgia for about three years, and she lived in 13 the highrise when it the first opened. 14Q So she lived in the highrise, and then she moved to Georgia. 15 16 Moved to Georgia, then moved back. Α 17 Do you know when she moved back from Georgia? About 1997. 18 Α Now, you said you would see Helen weekly. 19 Q 20 At least once a week, yes. Α Buy groceries for her. 21 Q I would by her groceries; I would put things in the 22 23 refrigerator; I'd fix her sandwiches. Things like 24 that. 25 What was her physical condition? Q

Α For her age, she was in very good physical 1 condition. She was -- she had to use a walker; but 2 3 other than that, I think she was in good physical condition. 4 What about mental condition? 5 Q Good. She had a wonderful will to live, and she 6 Α 7 was just a great gal. Was she organized? 0 8 Yes, very. 9 Α 10 Q Why was she organized? Partially because she was -- her sight was bad, and 11 Α 12 so she had to keep her apartment really neat and 13 clean so that she wouldn't trip on things. 14 Q Was she a religious woman? 15 Α Very. 16 Did she share her religion with others? 17 Α She shared it with us. I would assume she shared it with others. 18 Now, did she take medications? 19 Q 20 Α Yes. Do you know specifically what she was taking? 21 Q 22 Α No. 23 Did you dispense the medication? 24 Α No.

Do you know how it was dispensed?

There was a daily/weekly pill box. 1 MR. CRAWFORD: Objection, your Honor. 2 3 Speculation. THE COURT: Speculation. 4 MR. CRAWFORD: As to how it was dispersed. 5 said she didn't know how the pills were taken care of and 6 how they were dealt with. 7 THE COURT: Why don't you lay additional 8 foundation. I'll sustain the objection at this point. 9 10 BY MR. WILLIAMS: Did you know who dispensed the medication? 11 12 Α No. 13 Had you ever seen medication in her apartment? 14 Α Yes. Where was it located? 15 0 16 It was on the kitchen sink on the left side by the 17 stove. How was it kept? 18 There was a daily/weekly pill container, and then 19 Α 20 behind that there was a plastic container that had pill bottles in it. 21 This plastic container, do you know when Helen got 22 23 this pill container? 24 Α No. It was -- as far as I know, she had it ever 25 since she moved up here.

- Q You're talking when she moved from --
- 2 A -- Georgia.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q So, since you had -- she had moved back up from Georgia, she had had that pill container.
 - A As far as I know, yes.
 - Q You said that this -- the pill container and this pill box were on the counter. Were they always on the counter?
- 9 A Yes.
 - Q Did she wear any type of necklace or anything around her neck?
 - A She had an alarm. It was just a chain -- not a chain, but it was a -- like a shoestring thing that she wore around her neck. If she got in trouble, if she fell or something, couldn't get up, she could ring that; and they would usually call me, and I would got help her up or go get somebody else to help her up.
 - Q Did you see Helen on November 28, 2002 which would have been Thanksgiving Day?
 - A Yes.
- 22 Q Describe your contact with her that day.
- A Thanksgiving day we picked her up early afternoon,
 brought her over to our house. We had Thanksgiving
 dinner with our children and grandchildren, sat and

- 340 watched TV for a little while, and then we took her 1 2 home. 3 Q Do you recall what time you took her home? It was sometime 5, 5:30, somewhere in there. 4 Α How far is it from your home to the apartment 5 Q complex? 6 7 Ten minutes. Α Do you recall what time approximately you arrived 0 8 at the apartment complex? 9 It was -- that would make it probably about quarter 10 Α after five because we were watching some TV program 11 12 that would have been over by five. 13 Q So somewhere, I guess, between 5:15 and 5:45 you 14took her --Yes. 15 Α Could you describe what happened when you dropped 16 Q 17 Helen off? My husband parked out in the front area, I got out, 18 Α got her walker, got the food that we packaged up 19 20 for her, helped her out of the car, and I walked her up, and there was somebody sitting inside that 21 opened the door for her, and I kissed her, and she 22
 - Q Did she have anything with her?

walked in.

23

24

25

A We'd packaged up some food from Thanksgiving.

- Q Was she using her walker?
- A Yes.

- Q As she entered the building, what did she do?
- A I think she just thanked the gal that let her in, walked off towards the elevators.
 - Q And was that the last time you saw Helen alive?
- 7 A Yes.
 - Q Let's move onto February -- I'm sorry -- November
 29, which would be the next day, Friday. Describe
 what happened in the morning?
 - A I heard the telephone ring. My husband was up. He answered the telephone. He came in, and I was awake, and he said, "Helen's nurse called, and they couldn't get into the apartment." And I said, "Well, I'll go with you," because we have keys to get in, and so I got dressed. We grabbed a cup of coffee, and we went over to the apartment, walked in. We can get in -- we could get in the building and into her apartment, and so we unlocked the door and walked into her apartment.
 - Q Describe the lock on the door?
 - A It's similar to a deadbolt. It's -- you have to have a key -- if it's locked, you have to have a key to open it. You cannot lock the door and shut the door.

- Q So when you leave, you have to lock it from outside so you don't lock yourself out.
- A Yes.

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- 4 Q And you the key.
- 5 A Yes.
 - Q And used it to open the door.
- 7 A Yes.
 - Q Describe what you saw when entered the apartment.
 - Helen, and we didn't see her in the main room so we walked a little farther, looked in the bedroom. We saw her laying on the floor in the bedroom, and I don't, you know, exactly what happened after that.

 We were all in shock. But Carol called 911. They told Carol to have somebody go touch the body, which my husband did, and then we just waited for them to get there. In the meantime, we went
 - Q Let's talk about her Bible. Where did she normally keep it?

through -- I saw -- her Bible was on the bed.

- A There was a -- like a coffee table, and it was in a box. It was in a Bible box under the coffee table.
- 23 Q Is this where she normally kept it?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q Where was that table in relation to her chair?

- 1 A It was right next to the chair.
- Q When you entered the apartment, where was the
- 3 Bible?
- 4 A It was on the bed open.
- 5 Q Now, did Helen ever put anything in the Bible?
- A Yes. She put money in it or had us put money in
- 7 it.
- 8 Q So you put money in the Bible.
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q How much did she typically keep in the Bible?
- 11 A Several hundred dollars. Anywhere between one and
- 12 probably five. She always kept money so if her
- daughter came up she could help them out to get up
- 14 here and get home.
- Q So she set some money aside if she needed it.
- 16 A Right.
- 17 Q And you would put that money in the Bible.
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q Did she ask you to do this periodically?
- 20 A When she saved up. It was usually in \$100
- 21 increments.
- 22 Q Did you check the Bible that day?
- 23 A Yes.
- 24 Q What did you fine?
- 25 A It was empty.

- 1 Q No money.
- 2 A No money.
- Q Did you find anything else that was out of place
- 4 other than the Bible?
- 5 A I think that's the main thing that struck me.
- 6 Q Do you recall seeing her walker?
- 7 A I -- I don't remember it, no.
- 8 Q What about curtains?
- 9 A I don't remember anything about the curtains.
- 10 Q Did she have a key chain?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q Did you recall seeing that?
- A No. She always -- she almost always when she
- 14 walked in, she'd put it on the -- as you walked in
- there's a kitchenette over here, and then there's a
- little table over here. She'd put it on that
- 17 table.
- 18 Q After 911 was called, did the police arrive?
- 19 A I don't know if it was the police or the paramedics
- or exactly what.
- 21 Q Were you ultimately interviewed by the police?
- 22 A Yes.
- MR. WILLIAMS: One moment, Judge. No further
- 24 | questions, your Honor.
- THE COURT: Mr. Zook, any questions?

STATE'S WITNESS - CAROL CONVERSE - (CROSS)

MR. ZOOK: Thank you, yes.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. ZOOK:

- Q Carol, I guess it's fair to say then that you didn't pay a lot of attention to the drugs. Is that right?
- A As far as what was there, no. I mean, we knew that she took a lot of medication, and the only time it would be necessary for us to know what it was is if we had to take her to the hospital, in which case, we would grab them and go.
- Q Grab them and go. Now, the things that the drugs were in there was a -- a rather flat -- or a couple of flat plastic pieces, right, with day -- it was divided up and into day and weeks, and there also was a tub where she kept some medicine that was still in the box.
- A Yeah. There was medicine. It was so, I don't know, about like this. It was like a Tupperware or plastic or something.
- Q Okay. Now, that's, when you say Tupperware, I think you said Rubbermaid before. Right?
- A You know, I don't know what it's made of. It's just a plastic container.
- Q Right. Sort of a generic item.

STATE'S WITNESS - CAROL CONVERSE - (CROSS)

A I guess.

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

14

15

16

19

- Q Are you positive that that particular container is the same container that was there when she came
- 4 back in '97?
 - A I'm not positive. As far as I can remember, it was the same one that she brought back.
 - Q It's at least similar?
 - A It'd be similar, yes.
 - THE COURT: Mr. Crawford, any questions.
- MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you, your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

12 BY MR. CRAWFORD:

- Q Ms. Converse, I believe you mentioned you went to

 Ms. Sailor's apartment several times a week. Is

 that correct?
- A At least once a week, yes.
- Q And when you were at the apartment, how much time did you spend?
 - A Oh, usually half hour to an hour.
- Q Okay. During that period of time, did you get to know her neighbors across the way at all?
- 22 A We knew one neighbor across the way, yes.
- Q Did Helen ever visit with that neighbor while you were there?
- 25 A The neighbor would come visit with her.

STATE'S WITNESS - CAROL CONVERSE - (REDIRECT) And how often did that frequently occur? Not -- not all that often. Not when we were there. Do you remember what that lady's name was? Mary Jane. MR. CRAWFORD: That's all I have. Thank you. THE COURT: Mr. Williams, any other questions? MR. WILLIAMS: Briefly. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. WILLIAMS: With respect to this medication tub with pills that

- Q were in it, the Tupperware container, after Helen returned in 1997, do you ever remember seeing more than one Tupperware container?
- 14Α The big container, no.
 - MR. WILLIAMS: Nothing else, your Honor.
- 16 THE COURT: Anybody have any additional
- 17 questions?

1

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

Α

Q

Α

- MR. ZOOK: No. 18
- 19 MR. CRAWFORD: No.
- THE COURT: You may step down. Watch your 20
- 21 step. Is she released from her subpoena?
- 22 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes.
- 23 MR. ZOOK: Yes.
- THE COURT: She'll be released from her 24
- subpoena. Call your next witness. 25

```
MS. BECKER: May we approach.
 1
                     (An off-the-record discussion was held
 2.
 3
                     at the bench.)
                MS. BECKER: Dr. Joseph Prahlow.
 4
                THE COURT: Raise your right hand, sir.
                      (The witness was sworn.)
 6
 7
                THE WITNESS: I do.
                THE COURT: Take the witness stand, sir.
 8
                         DR. JOSEPH PRAHLOW
 9
10
      called on behalf of the State, having been first duly
      sworn, testified as follows:
11
12
                         DIRECT EXAMINATION
13
      BY MS. BECKER:
14
            Doctor, would you please introduce yourself to our
15
            jury?
            Yes. My name Dr. Joseph Prahlow P-r-a-h-l-o-w.
16
            What do you do for a living?
17
        0
            I'm a forensic pathologist.
18
        Α
            What is forensic pathologist?
19
        Q
2.0
        Α
            A forensic pathologist is a physician who first of
            all becomes a pathologist, who is a physician who
21
            specializes in the study of disease. And then a
22
23
            forensic pathologist goes on to receive further
24
            training in forensic pathology, which specifically
            deals with the investigation of sudden unexpected
25
```

or violent death.

- Q Okay. Are there special -- or are there specialty areas in the science of pathology?
- A Yes.

2.0

- Q What types?
 - There are -- there are two major groups -- or divisions within the world of pathology. Again, pathology is the study of disease. There is anatomic pathology and clinical pathology.

 Clinical pathology has to do with the laboratory, laboratory aspect of medicine. So if you do have blood work done, if you have a throat culture done, the blood bank, all the laboratories, that's clinical pathology; and the pathologist kind of runs that. And each one of those areas can be a subspecialty within the world of pathology.

Anatomic pathology has to do with microscopic work, looking at tissues that are removed at surgery or biopsied, making diagnosis. Is this cancer? Is it not cancer? What type of cancer is it? Are the lymph nodes involved? That's what we call surgical pathology doing the microscopic work.

Another part of anatomic pathology is autopsy pathology. Doing a surgical procedure after death on a body, and that's an autopsy. And a

- subdivision of autopsy pathology is forensic pathology where we specifically investigate by performing autopsies, sudden unexpected or violent deaths.
 - Q In what type of pathology are you trained?
 - A I did a five-year residency in pathology which included anatomic and clinical pathology, and then I did a one year fellowship, one more additional year of training, in forensic pathology. I'm board certified in anatomic pathology, clinical pathology, and forensic pathology.
 - Q Well, presuming you had to probably getting an undergraduate degree before going through with the pathology further studies. Correct?
- A Yes.

Q Where is your undergraduate degree from?

in Dallas, Texas?

A I received a bachelor of science degree from

Valparaiso University in chemistry and biology. I

then got my medical degree, my M.D. degree from

Indiana University. And then I did my five year

residency in pathology at Wake Forest University,

which is in Winston Salem, North Carolina. And

then I did my one year fellowship in forensic

pathology at the University of Texas Southwestern

- Q After you finished your one year clinical in Dallas, Texas, did you stay in Texas?
- A Yes, I did.

- Q How long did you stay in Texas and, what did you do there?
 - A I stayed in Texas for three additional years following my formal training, and I stayed on faculty, or staff, at the University of Texas Southwestern at the Institute of Forensic Sciences there.
 - Q After you left Texas, where did you go?
- A In the middle of 1999, I moved back home to
 Indiana, to this area, where I took a job at the
 South Bend Medical Foundation as a forensic
 pathologist. And my duties include performing a
 bulk of the autopsies, whether they are coroner's
 cases, forensic cases or hospital autopsies. And I
 also teach the pathology course at the Indiana
 University School of Medicine south Bend campus at
 Notre Dame.
 - Q Any idea how many forensic autopsies you have performed in your career?
- A I have performed over 2000 autopsies.
- Q All right. I would like to draw your attention to
 November of 2002. Do you recall performing an

autopsy on the body of Helen Sailor?

A Yes.

2.0

- Q Can you please explain to us, first of all how you came into contact with this responsibility?
- A Well, as -- as -- in my role as a forensic pathologist at the South Bend Medical Foundation, I perform autopsies for various coroners around the area, including Elkhart County. So I was contacted by the Elkhart County coroner about this case and was, you know, given some background information about the case.

When that happens, the typical situation is we set up a time where the police can be there, the coroner can be there, and I can be there, meaning Elkhart General Hospital's morgue, and I can perform an autopsy. So that's what we did. We set it up, and I started the autopsy at Elkhart General Hospital on November 29th at 3:30 in the afternoon.

- Q When you began the autopsy on November 29 on the -- on the body of Helen Sailor, what did you do first?
- A The first thing that is done is to do what's referred to as an external examination where I look at the body. Depending on the case, we may collect trace evidence at that time or any other evidence that might need to be collected.

In this particular case after viewing the body initially, I did collect trace evidence. We took fingernail clippings, we performed a sexual activity kit, took hair standards, and then I proceeded with the external examination which involves taking note of the clothing the individual was wearing, jewelry then.

The clothing is removed, and we do a very complete external examine looking at the outside of the body and looking for any injuries that may be present, documenting those injuries by diagram as well as photography.

- Q Do you recall whether Helen Sailor's fingerprints were also taken at that time by the crime scene technician that was with you?
- A Typically, the fingerprints are taken after the case is complete. Taking fingerprints requires getting black ink on the fingers so -- in certain cases we'll take them -- the -- the -- the crime scene folks, the police officers will take them earlier on in the case. But the typical scenario is once I've completed the entire autopsy, then they do that.
- When you indicated that you collected trace evidence, do you do that with the crime scene tech

is present so that you can transfer possession directly to that detective?

2.0

- A Yes. Any evidence that I collect during the autopsy will take place in the presence of the police officers that are -- that are there. And I will collect the evidence either by myself or with the officer and then turn it over to the officer.
- Q All right. Let's go ahead and talk about the observations that you made about Helen Sailor. First of all, let's talk about her clothing. What did you note about Helen Sailor's clothing before your began any further investigation?
- A Well, the -- the best way to describe it would be that the clothing was somewhat disheveled. She was wearing a short-sleeved sweater, and it was at the mid chest level. She also had a pair of panties on with a disposable undergarment. She had a pair of pants and the waist of the pants were at her lower thigh level. She had a pair of stockings on, a pair of shoes, and a bra.

She also had two long-sleeves sweaters that were partially on her right arm. Through up and around the clothing she had some tissues like Kleenex that seemed to be soaked in some type of fluid. There was also a pink fluid like substance

on portions of the clothing and on her skin.

If you include jewelry as clothing, she also wore a white metal ring with a turquoise stone on the right ring finger, and she had a digital watch on her right wrist.

- Q Do you remember this liquid substance that was on her body?
- A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q How would you describe that for the jury?
- A It was pink. It was -- it didn't look like it was a -- a body fluid per say. Sometimes we'll see vomit that looks that color, but it didn't appear to be vomit per say. It was kind of a greasy -- almost greasy look to the pink. I wasn't sure what it was.
 - Q Do you know whether samples were taken of that by the crime scene detective?
- A I believe so, yes.
 - Q Okay. Let's go ahead and move on. After Helen's clothing was removed, did you have an opportunity to observe her body.
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q Did you look for any signs of trauma to her body?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q Starting with -- actually, let's start with the

torso and the legs and then go up.

She had what -- what I would call minor or superficial very relatively smaller insignificant looking, at least initially, injuries including some abrasions, which are scrapes or scratches, as well as contusions, which are bruises, in various parts of the body below the level of the head and neck.

Specifically, she had -- I need to refer to me notes so that I get it exactly correct -- on the left buttocks she had some blue contusions, bruises. She had some suttle contusions or bruises on the midportion of the left side of her back.

She had a subtle blue contusion of her upper left back.

- Q What about her neck?
- A Her neck had some significant injuries.
- Q We'll talk about it in detail though in just a few minutes. Also, in general, were there any other signs of trauma about her head and face area?
- A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

- 22 Q What were they?
- 23 A She had abrasions, or scrapes and scratches, as 24 well as bruises or contusions on her face.
- 25 Specifically again, she had a scrape/bruise on her

left forehead, she had an abrasion or a scrape on her nose, she had what most people would call black eyes on both sides. We call that bilateral, meaning both sides; periorbital, that means around the eyes; ecchymosis, which is another fancy way to call a bruise. So she had bilateral, both eyes; periorbital, around the eyes; ecchymosis, or bruising, so black eyes. She had some blood that came out of her right ear. She had a laceration of the tip of her tongue.

- Q Doctor, do you prepare notes so that you can keep all these injuries straight in light of all the autopsies that you do?
- A Yes.

- Q Do you also do diagrams so that you can document where injuries are on certain bodies?
- 17 A Yes.
 - Q I'd like to show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 2 and ask if you recognize this?
- 21 A Yes, I do.
- 22 Q What is it?
- A State's Exhibit 2 is photocopy of the body diagram
 that I prepared for Helen Sailor. It shows the
 front and back of a female's body nude, and then it

```
has on her the markings that I wrote on describing
 1
            some of the -- the injuries that I've already
 2
            described to you, but also some injuries that we
 3
            haven't talked about yet.
 4
            Okay. Does this diagram accurately depict what you
 5
        Q
            personally prepared during the autopsy or shortly
 6
            thereafter of Helen Sailor in November of 2002?
 7
        Α
            Yes.
 8
            Do you believe that this will assist the jury by
 9
        Q
10
            illustrating your testimony?
11
        А
            Yes.
12
        Q
            Thank you.
13
                MS. BECKER: State would now move to admit
14
      what's been marked for identification purposes as State's
15
      Exhibit 2.
                THE COURT: Mr. Crawford, any objection?
16
17
                MR. CRAWFORD: No, your Honor.
                THE COURT: And, Mr. Zook, any objection?
18
19
                MR. ZOOK: No, sir.
2.0
                THE COURT: You're offering 2.
                MS. BECKER: Yes.
21
                THE COURT: State's Exhibit 2 will be admitted
22
23
      without objection.
24
                MS. BECKER: State would move to publish
      State's Exhibit 2 by electronic publication.
25
```

```
THE COURT: Any objection, counsel?
 1
                MR. ZOOK: No, sir.
 2
 3
                MR. CRAWFORD: No, your Honor.
                THE COURT: Exhibit 2 will be published in the
 4
 5
      manner of choosing by the state.
                     (State's Exhibit 2 was published to
 6
 7
                     the jury.)
      BY MS. BECKER:
 8
 9
            Doctor, I'm going to hand you a remote control that
10
            has a red laser pointer on it. If you would be so
            kind, could please point out the are of bruising on
11
12
            the buttocks that you were describing?
13
        Α
            The left buttocks. I'm circling it with the laser
14
            pointer.
            Now, you also indicated there was a contusion in
15
16
            the midback. Where is that?
17
        Α
            Right there.
            You also indicated there was another contusion on
18
        0
            the left upper shoulder back area.
19
20
           Yes, right there.
        Α
            All right. Would you also describe any trauma that
21
        0
            you found on the hands of Helen Sailor or lower
22
23
            arms?
            Yes. She had extensive -- I mentioned earlier that
24
        Α
25
            the ones on the buttocks and the back were
```

relatively small. She also had a small contusion on the back of her left arm, the triceps area as I'm indicated here, but she had extensive contusions or bruising on the backs of both hands and the one on the back of the left hand extended up onto her forearm.

- Q Now, if you look to left of this diagram it shows a frontal view. Do you also have some notes documenting the trauma area to the neck and head region?
- A Yes.

2.0

- Q Could you please point out what those are for the jury to illustrate the exact areas you were discussing?
- Yes. She has abrasions, again, of the forehead, on the nose. She also has -- here I have B/L periorbital that's bilateral periorbital ecchymosis around the eyes more extensive on the right. She also had the neck injuries. I didn't get into detail about those when I was talking earlier, but she has abrasions as well as contusions around the neck, and she has other injuries as well there.
- Q Okay. Once again, we will get into more detail about the neck area, but let's go ahead and discuss these trauma areas on the remainder of her body and

- extremities. First of all, I'd association like to show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 2, do you recognize this? I'm sorry, 3.

 A Yes, I do.

 What is it?

 A State's Exhibit 3 is a photograph of Helen Sailor's
 - A State's Exhibit 3 is a photograph of Helen Sailor's left hand and forearm at autopsy showing that extensive contusion or bruising that I just talked about.
 - Q Thank you. Next I'd like to show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's

 Exhibit 4. Do you recognize this?
 - A Yes, I do.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q What is it?
- A State's Exhibit 4 is a photograph of Helen Sailor's right hand, the back of her right hand showing the contusion or bruising that I just talked about.
 - Q Thank you. Next I'd like to show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's

 Exhibit 5. Do you recognize this?
- 22 A Yes, I do.
- 23 Q What is it?
- A State's Exhibit 5 is a photograph showing the front of Helen Sailor's face at autopsy. Specifically in

this photograph, you can see the abrasion of the left side of the forehead. You can see the extensive abrasion or scrape or scratch on her nose. There is a ruler that covers over the left eye, but the right eye is visualized, and you can see the ecchymosis, or bruising, around the right eye.

- Q Next, I'd like to show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 6. Do you recognize this?
- A Yes, I do?

2.0

- Q What is it?
- A State's Exhibit 6 is another frontal photograph showing Helen Sailor's front of her face and neck and upper chest at autopsy. Again, on this one, you can see the abrasions that I just talked about. You can also see the bruising around both eyes.

 You can see some abrasions and bruises on her neck.

You can also see very well some of the other injuries that we haven't talked about which -- which are referred to as petechial hemorrhages. A petechial hemorrhage is a pinpoint hemorrhage, and she has extensive petechial hemorrhages from about midneck upwards involving her neck and face and head, and you can see these petechia all over her

1 face.

- Q Thank you. Next I'd like to show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's

 Exhibit 7. Do you recognize this?
- A Yes, I do.
 - Q What is it?
- A State's Exhibit 7 is a closer-up photograph of her face showing in more detail the petechial hemorrhages.
 - Q Thank you. Next I'd like to show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's

 Exhibit 8. Do you recognize this?
- 13 A Yes, I do.
- 14 Q What is it?
 - A State's Exhibit 8 is a photograph where I have placed a retractor, an eyelid retractor on the eyelid of Helen's Sailor's right eye to pull those open so that we can see the white part of her eye, which we refer to as the sclera. And I put this retractor for photography purposes so that we can document the injuries of her eyes. We can see some petechial hemorrhages, pinpoint hemorrhages of the whites of the eye, but also what refer to as ecchymosis, again, bruising that are bigger than petechia on the white parts of her eye.

- Q Now, you indicated that you have used something to hold the eyelids open. Has there been any instrument used other than that or any cutting or anything like that done on this photograph?
- A No. This was just during external examine. It's is just to visualize the eyes. There's no surgical manipulation at all. It's just a retraction.
- Q Okay. Thank you. Next I'm showing you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's

 Exhibit 9. Do you recognize this?
- A Yes, I do.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q What is it?
 - A State's Exhibit 9 is a photograph showing the -the mouth area of Helen Sailor at autopsy. Again
 in this photograph, there is an instrument there.
 It's a plastic lip retractor holding the mouth open
 so that we can see on the tongue the presence of
 contusions or bruises as well as petechial
 hemorrhages, the pinpoint hemorrhages.
 - Q Have any surgical manipulations been performed prior to this photograph?
- 22 A No.
- Q And does this show an accurate representation of what you observed during autopsy?
- 25 A Yes.

0 Now, in reference to what has been marked for 1 identification purposes as state's Exhibit 3 all 2 the way through State's Exhibit 9. Do all of these 3 photographs appear to be photographs that were 4 taken during autopsy on November 29, 2002? Α Yes. 6 7 Do you believe that they are fair and accurate Q representations of what you personally observed on 8 that day? 9 10 Α Yes. Do you believe that they will assist the jury in 11 12 illustrating your testimony as well as showing is 13 the actual trauma to Helen Sailor's body. 14 Α Yes. Thank you. 15 0 16 MS. BECKER: State would now move to admit 17 what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. 18 19 MR. ZOOK: No objection, your Honor. 2.0 THE COURT: Mr. Crawford? MR. CRAWFORD: No objection, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: State's Exhibits 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 22 23 and 9 will each be admitted without objection. 24 MS. BECKER: State would move to publish

State's Exhibits 3 through 9 inclusive by using

```
1
      electronic publication.
                THE COURT: Counsel.
 2
 3
                MR. ZOOK: No objection.
                MR. CRAWFORD: No objection, your Honor.
 4
                THE COURT: State's Exhibits 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8,
 5
      and 9 will be published without objection in the manner
 6
 7
      of choosing of the state.
                MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you, your Honor.
 8
      BY MS. BECKER:
 9
10
            State's Exhibit 3, you indicated this was the left
            arm of Helen Sailor. Can you identify why this is
11
12
            significant, this bruising is significant?
13
        Α
            Yes. Essentially, with the exception of this area
14
            right up here on the edge of the forearm and here
            and then the fingers, the remainder of the area
15
16
            that we are looking at is all bruised or contusion,
17
            which is very extensive; and you can see the
            swelling that occurs here. It's somewhat
18
            disfiguring of the back of the left hand and wrist.
19
2.0
            This would be the normal color of skin. So this is
            very extensive contusion of that area.
21
            Does this appear to be significant to you in your
22
23
            examination and your diagnosis?
24
        Α
            Significant in that it's a relatively major injury,
25
            yes. As far as, you know, would an injury like
```

- this cause death? Probably not. But it's significant in light of the other injuries that are present.
- Q Now, you indicated that the discoloration and the swelling. When you have done examinations and based upon your training and experience in the medical field, how fast can something like this set in an elderly person?
- A Very quickly.

- Q What do you mean by very quickly?
- A Within seconds of trauma being inflicted. Elderly individuals in particular can have very fragile blood vessels underneath their skin, and it's not infrequent in elderly individuals to see what they refer to as senile ecchymosis, meaning bruising related to that fragility of that older person's skin. And they can hit their hand on something and cause a little bruise there within seconds to minutes.
- Q You also indicated that the right hand of Helen Sailor also had bruising on it. What was significant about this?
- A This is similar to what we just saw except the bruising is not as extensive. It's in this area that I'm outlining -- outlining with the lazer

- pointer on the back of her right hand.
- Q Is there any way that you can determine to any degree of medical certainty how long this bruise has been there or when it was created?
- A No.

- Q You also indicated that there were several abrasions to Helen's face. Would you please describe so we know what you're talking about the areas of trauma that we're looking at right now?
- A Yes. In this case -- or in this photograph, first of all just for explanation, the white that you see is a reflection from the flash, the white areas, but the injuries as far as abrasions go are this dark area on the nose. Essentially, the entire surface of the nose has a scrape or scratch or abrasion on it, and then there's another abrasion on the left forehead. You can also see that there's discoloration of that right eye or the tissues around that right eye which we'd call a black eye or a periorbital ecchymosis.
- Q Now, moving on, I believe this would be State's
 Exhibit 6. Does this photograph also show
 additional injuries under the chin?
- A Yes. Again, kind of in the shadows up here you can see the abrasions we just looked at, the eye

contusions. There are abrasions on the chin and the area here. And this one we also start to get an idea of those petechial hemorrhages that I discussed, the pinpoint hemorrhages.

You can see there's a line right here at the neck below which we don't see any of those, but above which on the entire neck and head and face region we see abundant petechial hemorrhages, and there's pink purple discoloration of the remainder of the skin suggesting that very congested skin there.

- Q Doctor, let's actually talk about that at this point in time. What causes petechial hemorrhaging?
- Petechial hemorrhages occur for a variety of reasons all of which have to do with the blood pressure that is behind the blood vessels supplying the skin with blood. When there is a local increased blood pressure in those very small blood vessels that supply the skin, those little blood vessels can burst, and that results in a petechial hemorrhage.
- Q How would blood pressure increase in just a small area such as a head?
- A Well, one of the most common things that we see facial, neck, eye petechia in, is when there is

2.0

compression of the neck. What happens when there is compression of the neck is first of all the -the veins which are blood vessels that are thin walled, the blood returns towards the heart and the vein, they are compressed first with less force than the arteries.

Arteries are thicker walled, takes more pressure to compress them. But what first happens is those veins get compressed when there's compression of the neck. So the arterial pressure is still forcing blood up into the head and the face, but then the blood can't get back out of the head and face because the veins are being compressed by the compression of the neck. And that arterial pressure continues to build, and then you get these petechial hemorrhages in the small blood vessels.

- Q Now, we're looking again at State's Exhibit 7, and you indicated this is a closer up of the petechial hemorrhaging. Does this actually occur in the little cells that are next to the skin?
- A Yes. They actually occur in the skin, and this is just to show what they look like closer up. These are pinpoint hemorrhages. Now, some are really tiny pinpoint, others get more like the size of the

head of the pin.

2.0

- Q Okay. And what area of Helen's face are we looking at right now?
- A I believe this is the cheek, although without comparing with other photos, this is one of those retractors that is in another photo, so I believe this is the cheek here.
- Q Number 8, you indicated that her eye also had petechial hemorrhaging. What is the significance of the amount of this?
- A Yes. There are petechia here. You can see smaller one, but there's also ecchymosis, big -- bigger hemorrhages in the sclera. Again, the significance here would be as far as the petechia go that there is likely compression of the neck causing these, especially in light of some of the other injuries we haven't talk about yet.

It is my opinion that these result from the compression of the neck. The bigger hemorrhages can result from that as well with the blood building up; or they could be related to blunt injury, being struck in the face.

Q Normally, does there appear to be hemorrhaging in the sclera like this when there's absence of injury? A No.

2.0

- Q Okay. So what we're seeing here does indicate injury to you?
 - A Absolutely.
 - Q Thank you. And then 9 shows her mouth. You indicated that there was a laceration on her tongue. Can you show us where that is in the photograph?
 - A Yes. There's a contusion with a tear. I believe I mentioned the laceration when I was referring to my notes, but when I looked at the picture I -- I didn't say that I said there was a contusion, which there is, but there's also a tear, or a laceration, right there. This is the retractor, the plastic retractor holding the lips open. You can again see petechial hemorrhages of the lips and the cheeks. There are also petechial hemorrhages on the undersurface of the tongue.
 - Q Was there anything else about the mouth or even this injury in and of itself that you have seen before in certain types of situations?
 - A Just the fact that -- as far as the petechia, there were petechia throughout the gums in the floor of her mouth, again, indicating probable compression of the neck. The fact that there are the injuries

to the tongue, again, suggest possible -- a blunt force type of injuries impact, but also possible --

2.0

When I talk about compression of the neck, that's the category of asphyxial injury. Asphyxia means without a pulse, but we use it more commonly to refer to a lack of oxygen, and there are all sorts of asphyxial injuries one of which is compression of the neck. Another of which is compression of the mouth and nose and we call that smothering. You can sometimes see injuries such as the laceration and the contusion with tearing of the tongue, the bruise of the tongue, when there's a smothering type of mechanism occurring.

- Q Now, Doctor, let's go ahead and move along to the area of the neck. You indicated that there was also some trauma around Helen's neck. Can you please describe that in detail?
- A Yes. And we've seen a little of it in the photographs we've seen already. There was a circumferential, meaning all the way around the neck. What I refer to as a furrow mark, it's an abrasion, contusion -- abrasion and contusion caused by a ligature, something that can be readily wrapped around something, a ligature.

And when a ligature is wrapped around a neck

2.0

or wrists or body, they can leave marks; and we refer to that mark as furrow mark f-u-r-r-o-w, furrow, so that's the term that pathologists will use. She had a circumferential all the way around the neck furrow mark that measured 16 and a half inches all the way around the neck. It had a variable width ranging from less than one quarter inch to about one inch in width.

In areas there was a pattern to this abraded contused furrow mark consisting of small parallel lines. There were also areas that had a paradisecity of repetitive type of parallel lines in it. There were also other abrasions and contusions consistent with a ligature or other means of causing scrapes or scratches and bruises on the neck impact with other objections whether it's the ligature or fingers or an object of some sort. There are other abrasions and contusions, some of which we've seen already.

This ligature was about midway on the neck specifically measured from the top of Mrs. Sailor's head to where it was on the front of her body. The anterior part of her body was ten inches. On the back of her neck, it was seven inches. So it was roughly horizontal, somewhat upward as it went

back.

2.0

The petechia and the congestion of the neck and face that I discussed earlier was confined to the area above where that ligature was. Below that there were no petechia.

- Q Now, I'd like to show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 10. Do you recognize this?
- A Yes, I do.
- O What is it?
 - A This is a body diagram that I prepared in this autopsy on Helen Sailor. This body diagram shows four views of an adult face. The left side, the front, the right side, and the back. It also includes the neck. On this diagram with this particular case, I have indicated the injuries that I have just discussed with you and have notation about those injuries on this diagram.
 - Q Does this appear to be a true and accurate photocopy of the notes that you personally prepared on November 29, 2002 regarding the autopsy of Helen Sailor?
- A Yes.
 - Q Do you believe that this will assist the jury in illustrating your testimony and being specific

```
1
            about the location and the appearance of these
 2
            injuries?
 3
        Α
            Yes.
            Thank you.
 4
        Q
                MS. BECKER: State would move to admit what's
      been marked for identification purposes as State's
 6
 7
      Exhibit 10?
                THE COURT: Mr. Crawford.
 8
                MR. CRAWFORD: No objection.
 9
10
                THE COURT: And, Mr. Zook.
                MR. ZOOK: No objection.
11
12
                THE COURT: State's Exhibit 10 will be admitted
13
      without objection.
14
                MS. BECKER: State would move to publish
15
      State's Exhibit 10 by electronic display.
                MR. ZOOK: No objection.
16
                MR. CRAWFORD: No objection.
17
                THE COURT: State's Exhibit 10 will be
18
19
      published without objection in any manner of the state's
2.0
      choosing.
21
                     (State's Exhibit 10 was published to
                     the jury.)
22
23
      BY MS. BECKER:
            Doctor, you indicated -- first of all, let's just
24
            start with the top left of this diagram. What view
25
```

does that show?

2.0

- A Top left shows the left side of the face and neck.
- Q And what at the bottom can you tell us about the way you have drawn these lines?
- A You can see that I've drawn the furrow mark as it was evident at autopsy along the left side of the neck here.
- Q Is there anything significant about the number of furrow marks or the width or appearance of this furrow mark that you found to be important?
- Yes. The fact that it ranges, you know, up to a inch or so, but down to a quarter of an inch suggests first of all that the ligature perhaps measured approximately one quarter inch in width.

 The fact that we have areas where it measures wider than that suggests that there was sliding of that ligature on the neck or perhaps loosening and then retightening so that there areas that appear wider.

It's relatively frequent that we see this even if we know the exact ligature that is involved in a case. We see marks on the -- the neck that are wider than that because that ligature has moved around or had multiple periods of tightening or loosening. Whether there's a struggle involved or not, that can result.

So -- and then there are areas that I've indicated here. There's and area of central blanching where we have abrasion or scratch mark on either side of an area where there is nothing, and that suggests that it was a pretty significant area of tightening of the ligature when that injury was formed such that the sides of the neck that bent around the ligature as it was tightening had the abrasions or scratches from being up against that ligature whereas the part that was immediately under it was blanched, meaning the blood was pushed out of it as that injury occurred.

- Q When you tighten a ligature at such an extreme that is causes the skin to fold like that, does that take a significant amount of force?
- A Relatively speaking, when we're talking about neck, neck trauma, yes.
- Q All right. Now, in the bottom left side, you have the opposite side of the head; and if you look at right margin and the right margin of those two, you have some numbers written. Is that characteristic of the measurements that you took?
- A Yes. Are you talking about the seven and ten?
- Q Exactly.

2.0

A Yes. On this lower left portion of the diagram,

2.0

it's the right side of the face and neck; and again you can see a ligature mark. This one doesn't have nearly as much overlapping, and it doesn't get as wide, but what I've indicated on the upper diagram is at the back of the neck, this ligature measures seven inches from the top of the head. In the front, if measures ten inches from the top of the head as I -- as I explained earlier.

- Q Let's move now to the bottom right which would show the back of the head. Can you explain what these drawings that you've made here represent?
- A Yes. The bottom right is the back of the head, and you can see a continuation of that furrow mark across the back of the head, and this is where it would be seven inches from the top of the head here.
- Q And now let's go ahead and move up to the top right. What is significant about that mark, if anything?
- A This -- this furrow mark shows the -- that it crosses the -- about midlevel across the neck.

 Again, there is some -- some degree of criss-crossing here, and there's some contusions and abrasions there.
- Q This degree of criss-cross, is your diagram

accurate to show that maybe there's some area that was not effected by the ligature?

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Α Yes. And -- and I tried to draw these diagrams as accurately as possible again for my notation purposes keeping in mind that there are photographs taken also for absolute documentation. But this is drawn to show that as for coming from her right side of her neck this way across the very middle of the neck, it comes downward a bit, and then there's an area of blanching, and then it starts again.

This suggests that whatever ligature was there, that might be where a ligature is perhaps twisted; or we see this frequently in hanging deaths where the knot occurred in the noose. It's typically in the back of the neck, but you see this criss-cross type of configuration here where the furrow marks don't go right end to end continuously.

There appears to be a portion that kind of veers off to the side and another one coming in and an area of blanching. You could imagine in a hanging victim the knot in the back of the neck could have an appearance like that. So it -- so it suggests some twisting of a ligature, criss-crossing of the ligature, or a knot.

- Q All right. Now, I'd like to show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's

 Exhibit 11. Do you recognize this?
- A Yes.

- Q What is it?
- A State's Exhibit 11 is a photograph of Mrs. Sailor as autopsy showing that front portion of the neck that we've just described a little off to the side, the left side, showing in much greater detail than my diagram what I -- what I just tried to explain to you.
- Q Thank you. Next I'd like you to show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 12. Do you recognize this?
- 15 A Yes.
- 16 Q What is it?
 - A State's Exhibit 12 is a photograph of Mrs. Sailor at autopsy showing the left side of her neck again showing the furrow mark and showing some of the very subtle parallel lines that we refer to as a patterned abrasion that I described earlier.
 - Q Thank you. Next I'd like to show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's

 Exhibit 13. Do you recognize this?
- 25 A Yes.

- Q What is this?
- A State's Exhibit 13 is a closer-up view of the left side of Mrs. Sailor's neck at autopsy showing this pattern of four parallel lines, very small lines running together at the lower end this entire furrow mark that was on the neck.
 - Q Finally, I'd like to show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 14.

 Do you recognize this?
- 10 A Yes.

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- 11 Q What is it?
 - A State's Exhibit 14 is photograph showing the -- the back of Mrs. Sailor's neck. Again, you can see -- the furrow mark on the back, and there are areas that have that pattern to them again.
 - Q Do all of these exhibits, namely, State's Exhibits
 11, 12, 13, and 14 accurately represent what you
 personally observed on November 29, 2002 during the
 autopsy of Helen Sailor's body?
 - A Yes, they do.
 - Q Do you believe that they will assist the jury in illustrating you testimony and also provide evidence of the actual injuries you observed?
- 24 A Yes.
- Q And are -- were they all taken on November 29,

```
2002?
 1
        Α
           Yes.
 3
                MS. BECKER: Thank you. State now moves to
      admit what's been marked for identification purposes as
 4
 5
      State's Exhibit 11 through 14 inclusive.
                THE COURT: Mr. Crawford.
 6
 7
                MR. CRAWFORD: No objection.
                THE COURT: Mr. Zook.
 8
 9
                MR. ZOOK: No objection.
                THE COURT: Exhibits 11, 12, 13 and 14 will be
10
      admitted without objection.
11
12
                MS. BECKER: State moves for publication by
13
      electronic means.
14
                THE COURT: Counsel.
15
                MR. CRAWFORD: No objection.
16
                MR. ZOOK: No objection.
                THE COURT: Exhibits 11, 12, 13 and 14 will be
17
      published without objection in any manner of choosing by
18
19
      the state.
2.0
                MS. BECKER: Thank you, your Honor.
21
      BY MS. BECKER:
            Okay. State's Exhibit 11 you indicated was showing
22
23
            the ligature mark around the front of the neck.
24
            Can you show us where you're talking about a
25
            criss-cross pattern?
```

- A Yes. This area of the abrasion on the furrow mark has an extension somewhat downward here. Her feet are down to the left of the screen, her face is up here. So that abrasion continues this way.

 There's one that continues this way, but there's another that stops right here and does not intersect with this downward abrasion. That's where I'm talking about the crisscross pattern.
- Q Next is 12. Which side of the face of this is Helen's?
- A This is the left side of the neck. You can see her chin here. This is the bottom of the left portion of the ear. There's a lot of glare on this picture, the white; but the furrow mark is right here, and the area that is in the next photograph that is a close-up is an area where we can see four subtle parallel lines here. It will be much more visible in the next photograph.
- Q Go ahead and go to 12 then.

A These are the four parallel lines that I'm talking about in this ligature mark. And you can see them extending all the way along the side, this left side of the neck. You can see a contusion here, a bruise. You can see more of the abrasions and contusions of the furrow mark complex here. Here

is where it's measuring about one inch, and you can see that there's multiple areas where the ligature caused injury here. But this is what I refer to as a patterned abrasion, very specific. Four parallel lines running along this area that I'm indicating with the laser.

- Q And then finally, Helen -- the back of Helen's neck. What are there injuries around the neck?
- A Yes. The back of the neck the furrow mark runs in this location. Again, it's relatively wide in the back, and there are areas throughout this where you can see some of those four parallel lines again.

 Not nearly as well as we saw in the left picture, but focally in individual areas there we can see that pattern.
- Q Thank you, Doctor.

2.5

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to go to give you a recess at this time. You are all jurors in this case. I must tell you now and I will repeat this again each time you are permitted to separate.

Generally, you should not express any opinion about the case before it is submitted to you for deliberation; however, you are permitted to discuss the evidence presented in this case amongst yourselves in the

jury room during recesses from trial. All jurors and alternates must be present during these discussions. You must reserve judgment about the outcome of the case until your deliberations begin.

2.0

You are admonished that you may not discuss the facts of the case with anyone other than your fellow jurors.

You may not discuss this case with me or with the lawyers, parties or with any of the witnesses.

You should not listen to or read any outside or media accounts of the trial. You may not investigate the case or attempt to obtain information outside the courtroom. It is highly improper for you to do so. You are to consider and decide this case only upon the evidence received during the course of the trial in the courtroom. You may leave your notebooks turned upside down in your seats. You'll be in care of the bailiff.

(A short recess was had at this time.)

(The Court convened with all the parties present.)

THE COURT: The record should reflect the both defendants are present, counsel for each defendant is present, counsel for the state is present. Mr. Zook, you indicated you wanted to take up the issue of the state's proposed 404(B) evidence. State has filed notice of

1 intent to use 404(B) evidence, evidence of defendant 2 obtaining prescription drugs illegally and using the same and/or delivering the same to others in exchange for 3 marijuana. What do you have to say about that, Mr. Zook? 4 MR. ZOOK: Your Honor, I don't think there is any evidence of obtaining prescription drugs illegally. 6 7 No doubt Lana was getting prescription drugs. She had prescriptions for many prescription drugs. There would 8 be evidence of her exchanging that for marijuana. 9 10 THE COURT: That. What would that be? MR. ZOOK: Those prescription drugs she had. I 11 12 see no relevance to the state's case since I believe the 13 state's witnesses would establish that all of the pills 14 were accounted for. All of the prescriptions had enough pills to account for them at least that's how I read the 15 state's case that they appeared to be messed up, but 16 17 there were none missing. THE COURT: Ms. Becker, what evidence are you 18 seeking to introduce under the confines of your notice? 19 2.0 MS. BECKER: Under the -- or in light of the fact that the defendant, Lana Canen, fingerprint was 21 found on the medical container that contained a reservoir 22

23

24

25

of pills in Helen Sailor's apartment, and that medical --

or that container appeared to have been moved at least

contemporaneous with the crime. We've believe that it

shows motive. In other words, that the defendant, Lana Canen, is the person who touched and moved that container for the purposes of stealing pills from inside that container.

2.5

Now, Mr. Zook is partially right in that the state's evidence will be that there were all of her pills that she should have had were there. However, the state's evidence actually is going one step further than that they were so messed up that it's impossible to tell whether there were any missing or not because if they were that messed up then they can't say what should have been there to begin with.

THE COURT: So you don't know what should or should not have been there.

MS. BECKER: Correct. So we can't say --

THE COURT: How -- how would you say then or how would you prove that she took some of them?

MS. BECKER: We can't prove that she took some of them, but we can prove that somebody moved that container during the commission of the crime, and as a result a person's identical -- or a person's identity put on that, namely, the fingerprint, is incredibly important in this case.

THE COURT: What about fingerprint evidence, Mr. Zook? Any problem with that being admitted. It

would be appear to be inextricably intertwined.

MR. ZOOK: The fingerprint evidence is -- is -- is there, and there are enough points matching it that I don't doubt that they'll get that admitted. But I don't see how that opens the door to talk about marijuana, to talk about somebody being a pill freak. It seems to me that that's a totally different operation.

THE COURT: So what you're saying is the probative value of her alleged drug use or exchange on another occasion of pills for marijuana is outweighed by the prejudice.

MR. ZOOK: Right.

THE COURT: And what do you say to that,

Ms. Becker?

2.5

MS. BECKER: Your Honor, the State of Indiana believes that it is important for us to show why the defendant went for the -- went for the pill container.

We have three witnesses that will show that she regularly obtained prescription medication. She had variety -- one witness who actually called her a walking pharmacy, and that she provided these pills to persons in exchange for marijuana.

She wanted to get pills. There's no doubt about that. And while she may have had legal means of doing, she didn't have all legal means of doing that, and

she was known to take pills from other persons for the 1 purpose of getting marijuana for them. We believe that 2 it does show a motive. We believe that it ties her to 3 this crime without any other means of explanation. 4 THE COURT: I'll take the matter under 5 advisement. Are ready to go back with the jury? 6 7 MS. BECKER: Yes. (The jury entered the courtroom, and 8 the following proceedings were had.) 9 10 THE COURT: Be seated, please. Ladies and gentlemen, the recess lasted a little longer than 11 12 expected. We were working on some legal issues, and that 13 accounted for some of the period of the recess. ${\tt Ms.}$ 14 Becker. 15 MS. BECKER: Thank you, your Honor. 16 DIRECT EXAMINATION CONTINUED BY MS. BECKER: 17 Doctor Prahlow, you were indicating that based upon 18 your examination of the body of Helen Sailor during 19 2.0 autopsy that it was clear that she was strangled with a ligature. In addition to that, did you 21 notice any other diseases from which she was 22 23 suffering or any other problems with her physical 24 condition during the autopsy? 25 Α Yes.

Q What did you notice?

2.0

A On internal examination when the body is opened and the organs are removed one by one, we not only take note of injuries that are present we also take not of natural diseases that we may find.

Specifically, with Mrs. Sailor's autopsy, she had a heart that was somewhat enlarged, which is not unusual for someone as elderly as she is. She also had atherosclerosis, or hardening of the arteries, again, which is not unusual in the United States population. Specifically, she had some atherosclerosis, or hardening of the arteries, of the aorta, which is the large artery coming off the heart, supplies blood to the rest of the body, and that was from a mild degree to a severe degree focally.

She also had some atherosclerosis, or hardening of the arteries of blood vessels in the brain, but just to a mild extent. She also had some changes in her kidneys which suggests some atherosclerosis under the microscope.

- Q Were any of these internal deformities or deficiencies contributory causes to her death?
- A No.
- Q All right. Let's specifically talk about her cause

of death. You've indicated that she was strangled. You've indicated that she had some asphyxia. What exactly was the cause of Helen Sailor's death?

A In my opinion, the cause of death was strangulation.

2.0

- Q Okay. There's also term called manner of death, what does that mean?
- A The manner of death -- well, first of all the cause of death. The cause of death is either an injury or a disease, sometimes the combination of both of those that sets in motion the chain of events that leads to death. That's what the cause of death is. It's either an injury or a disease or a combination of those two.

The manner of death specifically refers to the means by which that cause of death occurred. In Indiana we have five choices for manner of death when a death certificate is filled out. We can call it a natural death. That's when the death is related to an underlying disease process. It's a natural death. It can be an accidental death, an unforeseen event. It can be a suicide, when someone takes their own life. It can be a homicide, death at the hands of another. And then we have kind of a fifth category where we don't

- have enough information to decide between those first four, and we can call it undetermined manner of death.
- Q In Helen Sailor's death, what was the manner of death?
- A The manner of death was homicide.
- Q So if you've got a death at the hands of another based upon your autopsy examination of Helen Sailor's body, that -- is it fair to say that that has enabled you to draw some conclusions just based upon what you've observed?
- A Yes.

- Q Specifically let's talk about the ligature marks ranging from a quarter of an inch all the way up to an inch, there being several repeated patterns the crossover, that type of thing. Because of the amount of differences and the changes in those, did it appear to you that death was instant when that ligature was applied?
- A No.
- Q Why not?
- A Because, again, basing it on my experience in doing other cases of strangulation, some of which there was no question unconsciousness occurred within a matter of seconds and then death followed shortly,

and then others where no question there was some 1 2 struggle or repeated applications of a ligature, 3 and based on my experience with those types of cases where I know for a fact what happened, it is 4 my opinion based on some of the things you just said, the fact that they're crossing over, they're 6 7 not just in one spot, the fact that there are other injuries on the body suggesting a struggle. It is 8 my opinion that unconsciousness and death was not 9 10 instantaneous. The wounds on her arms -- well, her left arm and 11 12 her right hand as well as some of the other 13 bruising, is that consistent with defensive wounds 14 that you've seen in the past? Those could be, especially the extremity ones, yes. 15 Α 16 0 Thank you, Dr. Prahlow. 17 THE COURT: Mr. Zook. MR. ZOOK: No questions. 18 THE COURT: And Mr. Crawford. 19 2.0 MR. CRAWFORD: No questions. THE COURT: You may step down, Doctor. Watch 21 your step. Is he released on his subpoena? 22 23 MS. BECKER: Please, your Honor. 24 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Mr. Zook, is he released?

```
MR. ZOOK: Oh, yes, sir.
 1
                THE COURT: He'll be released on his subpoena.
 2
 3
      Call your next witness.
                MS. BECKER: Thank you. The state would call
 4
 5
      Detective Mark Daggy.
                THE COURT: Raise your right hand, sir.
 6
 7
                      (The witness was sworn.)
                THE WITNESS: I do.
 8
                THE COURT: Take the witness stand.
 9
10
                             MARK DAGGY
      called on behalf of the State, having been first duly
11
12
      sworn, testified as follows:
                         DIRECT EXAMINATION
13
14
      BY MS. BECKER:
            Mr. Daggy, would you please introduce yourself to
15
16
            our jury?
17
        Α
            My name is Mark Daggy.
            What do you do for a living?
18
        Q
            I'm a detective with the Elkhart Police Department.
19
        Α
2.0
        Q
            Is there an area of the detective bureau at the
            Elkhart Police Department in which your specialize?
21
            Yes, I do.
22
23
            What area would that be?
24
        Α
           It's the homicide unit.
25
           In order to become a detective and then specialize
```

in the homicide unit, what kind of training and 1 experience have gone to? 2 3 Α I went to a two-week homicide school at the Southern Police Institute that was about two years 4 That's located at the University of 5 Louisville, and I also went to Cold Case School a 6 7 year ago at an Annapolis, Maryland that was put on by NCIS Naval Criminal Investigative Service in 8 Annapolis, Maryland. 9 10 Q In addition to that and prior to you homicide school as well as you cold case school, did you 11 12 have training and experience as a detective with 13 the police department? 14 Α Yes, I did. How long had you been a detective? 15 16 I'd say around -- before coming to the homicide Α 17 unit, about a year and a half two years as a regular detective. 18 How long had you been a police officer before you 19 Q 2.0 came out? Ten years. 21 Α Did you also have to go to the academy, the police 22 Q 23 academy in order to get training and experience to

become a police officer?

Yes, I did.

24

25

Α

- Q Have you also gone through many continuing education type seminars to teach you different skills in being a police officer and detective?
- A Yes, I have.

2.0

- Q What kinds of schools have you gone to to become a detective?
- A Went to Reid Interrogation Schools. That's one that really comes to mind as far as being a detective. There was a lot of on-the-job training.

 I have been to several undercover schools.
- Q In fact, part of the time that you were a police officer you did serve undercover. Correct?
- A That's correct.
- Q As part of your undercover duties, was it important for you to have communication with individuals that may be suspects, may be criminal witnesses, and that type of thing?
- A Yes.
 - Q Did you find that the skills that you learned at some of these training schools as well as your experience enabled you to have good communication and learn things that maybe somebody else wouldn't be able to learn?
- A Yes.
- Q Okay. Do you believe that these skills have

enabled you to be well-rounded as a homicide 1 detective? 2 3 Α Yes, I do. All right. And based upon the training and 4 Q experience that you have, have you been assigned as lead investigator in certain homicide cases 6 currently pending, specifically this one, at 7 Elkhart City Police Department? 8 Yes, I have. 9 Α 10 Let's go ahead and talk about Thanksgiving of 2002 and the murder of Helen Sailor. First of all, were 11 12 you lead detective on that murder in thanksqiving 13 of 2002? 14 Α No, I wasn't. All right. Are you familiar with the officers who 15 0 16 were? 17 Α Yes, I am. Who were the officers that were the lead 18 0 19 investigators at the time Helen Sailor was 2.0 murdered? At that time, the lead officer was Detective 21 Α Thayer. He's now a sergeant, uniform division, and 22 23 Detective D'Andre Christian. 24 0 Okay. Now, at the time that the murder occurred, was there an investigation done by Detective Thayer 25

and Detective Christian?

A Yes, there was.

- Q What kinds of things were done during that initial investigation?
- A Initially they would -- they canvassed the entire apartment complex, witnesses, neighbors. They -- initially the scene was secured. Detective technicians came in and processed the entire scene, performed interviews, just kind of hit the road and asking questions of people that were near or resided inside the Waterfall Highrise.
- Q Based upon -- well, first of all, what is a canvass of the area?
- A Basically, canvassing the area, you can go door to door asking if -- you've seen the residents inside the doors, if they've heard anything, something unusual. And to me canvassing is, you know, if you seen anything in the immediate area that presents a red flag or need to be -- possibly might be evidence. It could be in and around the building.
- Q Within the first three days of the investigation, were you able to gather or was the police department able to gather quite a bit of information about what had been going on?
- 25 A Yes.

- Q Even though they gathered a significant amount of information, were there really any red flags to begin with?
 - A No, I don't believe so. I don't -- I don't think that at the very beginning a suspect rose to the top.
 - Q Did there come a time when some information involving a person by the name of Lana Canen threw a red flag into the investigation?
- A Yes.

- Q All right. Now, we can't talk about specifically what that is at this point. But let's go ahead and discuss what happened with this case after the first three days.
- A I'd say -- well, in November of 2002 when this occurred -- can you repeat that?
- Q Sure. What happened -- after the first three days, you know, those first three hot days when you talked about the canvassing of the neighborhood, interviewing witnesses, gathering information, were there any suspects at that time?
- 22 A No.
- Q Okay. Did the investigation continue past that time?
- 25 A I would say it continued, but it wouldn't -- slowed

down within the first two to three months. I mean, 1 2 it pretty much slowed down. 3 Q Why was that? I believe the investigators at the time ran out of 4 А leads. 5 When in an investigation you get a lead, what I 6 7 would characterize as a red flag, do you send people out, do interviews, try and get to the 8 bottom of that? 9 10 Α Yes, we do. 11 Q And as a result of following up on these leads, did 12 a suspect emerge? 13 Α No suspect or suspects emerged. 14Q Okay. Any idea how many detective, officers, ect., had been working on this investigation? 15 Well, initially there probably was a handful of 16 Α 17 them, maybe four or five; but it -- ultimately at the beginning I would say Detective Todd Thayer and 18 Detective Christian had the responsibility of this. 19 20 Did they also have other detectives that would go Q out and interview people so that they wouldn't have 21 to spread themselves so thin? 22 23 Yes, they did. Α 24 0 And did they from time to time, I call it powwow, confer with each other to see what each other had? 25

- A Yes, they did.
 - Q Even with all this work, any suspects?
- A No.

2.0

- Q Did there come a time when the homicide unit was formed so that you could devote more time to this type of case?
- A Yes, we did.
- Q When the homicide unit was formed, was this one of first cases that you took up?
- A I think it was the first case.
- Q All right. What was special about the homicide unit that enabled you to focus exclusively on this case and give it intense attention?
- A We had the luxury -- I mean, this is -- our department formed a homicide unit. We never had this before. So we had the luxury of four or five fresh cases looking at a case, not developing any tunnel vision, and concentrating all their time on this homicide.

And usually, we would work just one homicide case, whether it we cold or a fresh case, we'd look at that one case. And in the past, we wouldn't have that luxury. You'd have -- you'd have a detective that would get assigned a homicide case, plus he'd have all these other cases, burglaries or

403 robberies so their -- their case load will build 1 up. We had the luxury of just working on just this 2 3 one case. Five heads looking into it. When homicide took this case on, did you go 4 Q reinterview individuals that had been originally 5 interviewed back at the time of the murder? 6 7 Yes, we did. Α And when was that? 0 8 I believe it was August of 2003 is when we started 9 Α 10 this. Okay. And in August of 2003, were able to locate 11 Q 12 most of the people that had provided information 13 originally? 14Α Yes. Were all those people reinterviewed? 15 0 16 Α Yes. After they were reinterviewed, did you learn some 17 additional information that started to kind of fall 18 into a context at this point? 19 20 Yes, we did. Α Now, although we can't talk specifically, you 21 Q indicated earlier that there was a red flag that 22 23 surrounding Lana Canen's name. Correct. 24 Α Correct. 25 Now, did there come a time when Lana Canen was

known to be with another person by the name of 1 Nina -- Nina Porter? 2 3 Α Yes. Did somebody go talk to Nina Porter after she had 4 Q been with Lana Canen from your Police Department? 5 Yes. 6 Α 7 And after that, did the leads start to develop and Q things fall into place? 8 Yes. 9 Α 10 0 After that occurred, did one of the detectives from homicide actually go interview a person? 11 12 Α Yes. 13 Q Who was that person? 14 Α Nina Porter. After Nina Porter. 15 0 16 Andrew Royer, sorry. Α 17 Okay. Based upon what you had learned from Nina and the information that you had at that time, did 18 the interview of Andrew Royer provide crucial 19 20 information about the murder of Helen Sailor? Α Yes. 21 MR. ZOOK: Objection, your Honor. I believe 22 23 that's a multiple question. 24 THE COURT: Rephrase your question. 1111 25

BY MS. BECKER:

1

2

3

4

6

8

9

- Q Okay. After you had gained this information from

 Nina Porter and the interview with Andy Royer, did

 the investigation take on a new character?
- 5 A Yes, it did.
 - Q Were you able to identify suspects at that time?
- 7 A Yes, we were.
 - Q Now, did you actually conduct the interview with

 Andrew Royer when he was first interviewed in

 August or September of 2003?
- 11 A No, ma'am, I did not.
- 12 Q Did you observe some of it?
- 13 A Some of it I did.
- Q And were you privy to the information obtained during that interview?
- 16 A Yes.
- Q Was there a subsequent interview of Andrew Royer
 just a day later?
- 19 A Yes, there was.
- 20 Q Did you conduct that interview?
- 21 A No, I did.
- 22 | Q Were you -- did you observe that interview?
- 23 A I don't believe I did.
- 24 Q Were you privy to information in that interview?
- 25 A Maybe from a supplement or a statement.

- Q Was it consistent with the information that he provided the first day?
- 3 A It varied.
- Q Now, after you had these things and later on, did
 you actually interview Andrew Royer?
- 6 A Yes, I did.
- 7 Q When did that take place?
- 8 A It's about a year ago. It was June of 2004.
- 9 Q Okay. When you interviewed Andrew Royer, did you advise him of his rights?
- 11 A Yes, I did.
- 12 Q How did that come about?
- A I read -- I read his Miranda Form right to him.
- 14 There were two attorneys present. He stated
- 15 that -- Andy -- Andy stated that he wanted to come
- 16 clean.
- Q Did he review his rights?
- 18 A Yes, he did.
- 19 Q Did he acknowledge that he understood them?
- 20 A Yes, he did.
- 21 Q Did he waive those rights in your presence?
- 22 A Yes, he did.
- 23 Q All right. Now, did you ask him questions about
- the murder of Helen Sailor at that time?
- 25 A Yes, I did.

- Q Now, you were aware of what he had said earlier.

 Correct?
 - A Correct.

- Q When you go into a subsequent interview knowing what hasn't been said earlier, do you suggest or do you remind them of what they said earlier as they're giving new information?
- A Yes. If they get to a point where it's -- well, no, I don't. But if it gets to a point where the story is totally different, we might remind them that, hey, your story is different.
- Q In fact, why don't you educate us a little bit on how you take a statement. What do you do in order to get information from an individual that you believe may be involved in a crime?
- A What I usually do is I would -- in this case, I took Andy back to the Thanksgiving of 2002, start from the morning when he woke up, and I just let him talk like he did, let him answer, you know, what happened next. Okay. What happened next. Okay. And just kind of go from there. I don't know if that answers your question.
- Q Uh-huh. Even though you're aware of things that such as physical evidence or what he said before, do you interject that to try to get him back on

track, or do you just let him do his thing? 1 I let him do his thing. I don't want to provide 2 Α 3 him with anything. Why is that? 4 Q 5 Because that would appear to be leading. When you spoke to Mr. Royer about a year ago and 6 7 you started asking him questions abut what happened on Thanksqiving, what did Mr. Royer tell you 8 happened on Thanksgiving of 2002? 9 10 Α He said that his mother came over to highrise, picked him up. He said that he left the highrise 11 12 with his mom at 1:00 p.m. and got back to the 13 highrise being dropped off by his mother at 4:00 14 p.m. He said he came back to his room, he took a 15 nap --16 MR. ZOOK: Your Honor, may we approach. 17 (An off-the-record discussion was held at the bench.) 18 THE COURT: Correct, Mr. Zook, not necessary to 19 20 have that recorded. Is that correct? MR. ZOOK: That's right. 21 THE COURT: Ms. Becker, proceed. 22 23 BY MS. BECKER: 24 Okay. So, the defendant Andy Royer indicated that he had been picked up at one dropped off at four. 25

What happened next? 1 2 He stated to me that he came back to the apartment, 3 took a nap, woke up, went to Martins Supermarket, bought a case of beer, drank about eight years, and 4 got really drunk, and came back to his room. Did he say what he did when he came back to his 6 7 room after getting -- or came back, got really drunk, and then what did he do? 8 Went back to bed. 9 Д 10 0 All right. Was this consistent with the information that Mr. Royer had provided before? 11 12 Α No. 13 Okay. Did you point that out to him? 14 Α I believe I did. Did he change his story at all? 15 0 He didn't change his story. 16 17 Okay. In fact, how many different versions from the defendant were you aware of by this point? 18 THE COURT: Excuse me. When you say "the 19 20 defendant," are you referring to Mr. Royer. 21 MS. BECKER: I'm sorry. Andrew Royer. THE WITNESS: I believe three or four. 22 23 BY MS. BECKER: 24 In an investigation, does that throw up some red 25 flags for you?

410 Α Yes. 1 Now, the defendant Andy Royer told you during your 2 3 interview he wasn't there. Correct. 4 А Okay. Did that alone make him a suspect just the 5 fact that he was lying to you? 6 7 MR. CRAWFORD: Objection, your Honor. THE COURT: Rephrase your question. 8 BY MS. BECKER: 9 10 The fact that it had been inconsistent from 11 previous statements? 12 Α Yes. 13 Q Are you also familiar with the investigation as it 14 focussed around Lana Canen? Yes, I was. 15 Α Was Lana Canen originally interviewed by detectives 16 Q back when this murder occurred in 2002? 17 Well, they made several attempts to get ahold of 18 Α her, but I do not believe there was any formal 19 2.0 statement taken from her at all. Okay. Do you know if they ever actually just 21 Q talked to her? 22 23 They did talk to her. Α 24 0 Some time later, did a detective with the homicide division, well, in August of 2003 have an 25

opportunity to interview Lana Canen? 1 2 Α Yes. Okay. Did you actually conduct that interview 3 Q yourself? 4 5 Α No, I did. Did you observe that interview or parts thereof? 6 7 I believe parts of it I did. Α Okay. Did Lana Canen provide a story or a version 0 8 of where she was on Thanksgiving of 2002? 9 10 Α Yes, she did. Subsequent to that, were you able to interview 11 Q 12 additional witnesses to corroborate or contradict 13 that information? 14 Α Yes, I was. Did they corroborate it or contradict it? 15 0 MR. ZOOK: Objection, your Honor. 16 17 THE COURT: Sustained. MR. ZOOK: This is just hearsay. 18 THE COURT: Sustained. 19 20 BY MS. BECKER: Has it been your experience that when an 21 investigation does not have any suspects to begin 22 23 with it's difficult to put things in context? 24 Α Yes. 25 Once you obtained the additional statements from

Andrew Royer and Lana Canen, were you able then to 1 go back and look at the original information 2 obtained and put it into context? 3 Yes. 4 Α Once you have done that, do you put the entire investigation together for purposes of presenting 6 7 it at a trial? Yes, we do. Α 8 9 MS. BECKER: Can I have just a moment, your 10 Honor. THE COURT: You may. 11 12 (An off-the-record discussion was held 1.3 between counsel for the state.) 14 MS. BECKER: No further questions at this time. 15 THE COURT: Mr. Zook, any questions? 16 MR. ZOOK: No, sir. THE COURT: And, Mr. Crawford, any questions? 17 MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you, your Honor. 18 19 CROSS-EXAMINATION 2.0 BY MR. ZOOK: Detective, when was it that you first got involved 21 0 in this homicide investigation? 22 23 I believe it was August of 2003. Α 24 0 And you made references to the early stages of the 25 investigation. Am I to assume that you relied upon

413 information in making those statements earlier in 1 your testimony? 2 3 Α I don't understand the question. You made statements concerning how your -- how the 4 Q initial investigation began. How were you able to 5 come up with that information? 6 I -- I read it. 7 Α So you read it. You actually were not a 0 8 participant in that initial investigation. Is that 9 10 correct? 11 That's correct. 12 Now, in reading those statements, did you come 13 across the various -- the various names of people 14 during the course of the investigation early on? Yes. 15 Α 16 And of those individuals was an individual by the name of Larry Woodridge? 17 18 Α Yes. And I believe he was resident of the Highrise. Is 19 Q 20 that correct? That's correct. 21 Α And also an individual by the name of Tony Thomas. 22 23 Is that correct? 24 Α That's correct. 25 Q And you mentioned that the first red flags were

Andrew Royer and Lana Canen. Isn't that correct? 1 When we -- when we took it. 2 Α 3 Q Just your portion of the investigation, not the initial investigation. 4 Α That's correct. 5 Okay. So you were -- when you spoke that way, you 6 7 were relying upon only your portion of the investigation. 8 But we looked at the old -- we looked at the 9 Α 10 old information. We take that into account so that 11 when we start the new investigation, you know, we 12 form our own investigation and our -- our own 13 suspects. 14But if there were any red flags early on, those might have come from either Detective Thayer or 15 Detective Christian. Is that correct? 16 17 Α That's correct. Because they were the private investigators? 18 Q That's correct, but we still -- we still check 19 Α 20 those out. Okay. Now, you mentioned that you were only 21 Q actually involved specifically with the last 22 23 interview of Mr. Royer. Is that correct? 24 Α That's correct.

Did you have any participation whatsoever in the

initial interviews or interrogations with Mr. 1 2 Royer? 3 Α I didn't sit in -- sit on in with Mr. Royer. There were portions of -- of it that I witnessed on a 4 5 close circuit television, but I did not participate in the room. 6 7 Were you there when he was driven to the Elkhart Q Police Department? 8 9 Α Yes. 10 0 And were you present with him when you went to the -- or when he was taken to the Elkhart Police 11 12 Department? 13 Α Yes, I was. 14 Q Did he comply with your request to go? He certainly did. 15 Α And that first time that you spoke with him, do you 16 Q recall the date of that? 17 Not off the top of my head. 18 Α Okay. The first time that he was spoken with, was 19 Q 20 that the date of the first initial report was done with Mr. Royer that same day, to your knowledge? 21 Yes, sir. 22 Α 23 And when you picked him up, do you know if he had 24 his medication before he was taken to the police 25 station?

I don't know for sure if he had his medication or 1 2 not. 3 Do you know if he had it with him when he went to the police station? 4 I don't think he did. 5 That's your recollection (intelligible)? 6 7 That's my recollection. Α Do you recall what time it was that you took him to 0 8 the police station the first time? 9 10 Α It was in the morning. I would say around close to 9:00 a.m. 11 12 Now, you mentioned that you had interviewed or 13 reinterviewed a lot of witnesses in the beginning 14 of August of 2003. Is that correct? Yes, sir. 15 Α 16 Were a lot of these individuals present or located Q at the highrise where Ms. Sailor had died? 17 18 Д Yes. MR. CRAWFORD: No further questions, your 19 20 Honor. THE COURT: Ms. Becker, any other questions? 21 MS. BECKER: Yes, thank you. 22 23 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 24 BY MS. BECKER: You indicated that you do refer back to the 25

417 original detectives and their written documentation 1 2 in beginning your case review. Is that correct? 3 Α Yes. Is it a requirement that you go ahead and provide 4 Q supplements or police reports whenever you do 5 things on a case? 6 7 Α Yes. All right. And is that something that you put in 0 8 as many details as you can remember? 9 10 Α Yes. And then do you rely on that when you are 11 Q 12 furthering an investigation? 13 Α Yes. 14 Q Do you take it as gospel, or do you do your own investigation? 15 16 We do our own investigation. Α After reviewing what had been previously been done, 17 0 did you then go back out and ensure that you had 18 all of your questions answered as well? 19 20 А Yes. All right. Now, several names were mentioned. 21 Q Larry Williams, Tony Thomas. Was further 22 23 investigation done with those individuals? 24 Α Yes. 25 Q In fact, Matt Johnson, Martha Haff, many other

418 people were mentioned in this investigation. 1 Correct? 2 3 Α That's correct. Now, did the detectives in homicide focus on 4 Q following up on those types of leads? 5 6 Α Yes. 7 In fact, how far did you push those kinds of leads? Q We pushed them until we couldn't follow anymore. Α 8 During this time did any evidence arrive? 9 Q 10 Α No evidence. Well, that showed that anyone other than the 11 Q 12 defendants were responsible for Helen Sailor's 13 death? 14 Α No. Okay. Was there any evidence you could put your 15 0 finger on at all that would indicate that Tony 16 17 Thomas or Larry Wood or any of these other people had anything to do with this? 18 There was no evidence. 19 Α 20 Mr. Crawford mentioned any other red flags. Even Q if it wasn't a name or a person, if there was a red 21 flag or something that didn't sit right with you in 22 23 the investigation, did you follow-up on it? 24 Α Yes. 25 Did anything lead to any place other than the

defendants in this case?

A Nothing else.

- Q And when you reinterviewed people in August of 2003, did you find that the information that you obtained from them -- actually, strike that. What was one of the biggest challenges that you found in the witnesses in this case?
- A The biggest challenge when reinterviewing all these witnesses, a lot of them had mental -- diminished mental capabilities, that was really hard. A lot of them were elderly, so a lot of them had -- they had trouble communicating to you.

We had to, you know, we had to slow down when we talked to the elderly and not be too fast just so they could understand our -- our questions. The Waterfall Highrise just has a lot of tough witnesses because you have the elderly, and you got people with mental -- diminished mental capability. That was the toughest aspect of this case.

- Q In light of the fact that you had these types of witnesses -- well, let me ask you this. When you get a statement from somebody, even if it doesn't seem to be accurate, do you still record it the way that they say it?
- 25 A Yes.

1 0 Why? Because it's their words. It's accurate to them. 2 3 Q Okay. Can you make any firm decisions just based upon looking at one statement from one person and 4 saying, boy, this is it? 5 No. It's just a part of the puzzle. 6 7 Has it been your experience that you have to wait Q until you get everything? 8 Yes. 9 Α 10 0 I'm sorry. Before you can start putting things together? 11 12 That's correct. Α 13 Is that what happened in this case? 14 That's what happened in this case. 15 MS. BECKER: I don't have anything further. 16 Thanks. 17 THE COURT: Does anybody have any other questions, Mr. Crawford? 18 19 MR. CRAWFORD: I do, your Honor. 2.0 RECROSS-EXAMINATION 21 BY MR. CRAWFORD: You mentioned that several of the people that you 22 23 spoke to had diminished mental capacity. Is that 24 correct? 2.5 That's correct.

0 During the course of your conversations with Mr. 1 Royer and your involvement with him, would you 2 classify him in that category? 3 Yes, I would. 4 Α During the course of your investigation, did you 5 come into contact with a lady by the name of Mary 6 7 Jane Dejong? Yes, I did. Α 8 And did you specifically interview her? 9 Q 10 Α Yes, I did. Was she -- do you recall during the course of your 11 Q 12 investigation where she resided? 13 Α I believe it was on the tenth floor room 1001. 14 Q About the same location area where Helen Sailor resided? 15 16 Α Yes. 17 Did you follow-up on any leads that she gave you? Yes. Yes, I did. 18 Α Did those take you anywhere? 19 Q 20 А No. MR. CRAWFORD: Nothing further, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Mr. Zook, any questions? 22 23 MR. ZOOK: No questions. 24 THE COURT: Ms. Becker, any other questions?

MS. BECKER: No questions.

```
STATE'S WITNESS - LARRY HAACK - (DIRECT)
 1
                THE COURT: You may step down. Counsel
      approach, please.
 2
 3
                      (An off-the-record discussion was held
                     at the bench.)
 4
                THE COURT: Call your next witness.
 6
                MS. BECKER: Thank you. Larry Haack.
 7
                THE COURT: Raise your right hand.
                      (The witness was sworn.)
 8
                THE WITNESS: I do.
 9
10
                THE COURT: Take the witness stand.
11
                             LARRY HAACK
      called on behalf of the State, having been first duly
12
      sworn, testified as follows:
13
14
                         DIRECT EXAMINATION
      BY MR. WILLIAMS:
15
16
            Would you please introduce yourself to the jury?
17
        Α
            My name is Larry John Haack.
            What's your occupation?
18
        Q
19
            I'm store manager for Martins Supermarket on
        Α
            Jackson Street, Elkhart, Indiana.
20
21
            And is that in a shopping plaza?
        Q
            Yes, it is.
22
23
            What shopping plaza?
            It's called Easy Shopping Center.
24
        Α
25
            You said East Jackson. What's the specific
        0
```

STATE'S WITNESS - LARRY HAACK - (DIRECT)

- 1 address?
- 2 A 555 East Jackson.
 - Q How long have you been the manager for that store?
- 4 A A little over ten years.
- 5 Q What are your responsibilities as the manager?
- A Run the entire store, daily operations, scheduling.
 - Q Are you -- I'm sorry. Go ahead.
- 8 A I could go on and on.
 - Q Are you in charge of reviewing sales records?
- 10 A Yes, I am.
- 11 Q And do you document sales record each day for the
- 12 store?

7

- 13 A Yes, we do.
- 14 O How does that occur?
- 15 A It's actually done through a computer -- through
- the computer. You know, everyday we get a printout
- of daily sales.
- 18 Q Now, I want to take you back to November 28 of
- 19 2002.
- 20 A Okay.
- 21 Q Were you -- you were the manager of the store at
- 22 that time.
- 23 A That is correct.
- 24 Q What were the hours of the store on Thanksgiving
- 25 day of 2002?

			424
1	A	We were closed that day. We have always been	
2		closed on Thanksgiving Day. I've been with Martins	
3		36 years, and we haven't been open on Thanksgiving	
4		Day.	
5	Q	So you have independent recollection that you	
6		weren't open on November 28, 2002?	
7	A	I do, and I also have sales records showing that we	
8		were not open that given day.	
9	Q	So there was a lack of sales records.	
10	A	There was zero records.	
11	Q	The next day would be Friday the 29th.	
12	A	That is correct.	
13	Q	Do you recall what time the store was open?	
14	A	6:00 a.m.	
15	Q	No further questions.	
16		THE COURT: Mr. Zook.	
17		MR. ZOOK: No questions.	
18		THE COURT: Mr. Crawford.	
19		MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you, your Honor.	
20		CROSS-EXAMINATION	
21	BY MR	. CRAWFORD:	
22	Q	On the day before Thanksgiving, what time would you	
23		have closed?	
24	A	10:00 p.m.	
25		MR. CRAWFORD: No further questions.	

THE COURT: Mr. Williams, any other questions? 1 2 MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: You may step down, sir. Watch your step please. Call you next witness. 4 MS. BECKER: Can we approach? THE COURT: Certainly. 6 7 (An off-the-record discussion was held at the bench.) 8 9 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going 10 to let you go a couple of minutes early today for lunch. During the recess, I need to tell you. You are 11 all jurors in this case. I must tell you now and I will 12 13 repeat this again each time you are permitted to 14 separate. 15 Generally, you should not express any opinion about the case before it is submitted to you for 16 17 deliberation; however, you are permitted to discuss the evidence presented in this case amongst yourselves in the 18 19 jury room during recesses from trial. All jurors and 2.0 alternates must be present during these discussions, and 21 you must reserve judgment about the outcome of the case until your deliberations begin. 22 23 You are admonished that you may not discuss the 24 facts of the case with anyone other than your fellow 25 jurors.

You may not discuss this case with me or with the lawyers, parties or with any of the witnesses.

2.0

You should not listen to or read any outside or media accounts of the trial. You may not investigate the case or attempt to obtain information outside the courtroom. It is highly improper for you to do so. You are to consider and decide this case only upon the evidence received during the course of the trial in the courtroom.

As I said, we're going to let you go a couple of minutes early. I'd like you back around 1:15. We'll try to attempt to get into the courtroom at 1:30. This is smaller town. There are not a lot of restaurants in town. Be cautious when you're having lunch that you do not overhear any conversations any of the persons in the audience sections may be having if it relates to this case. Once again, you can leave your notebooks here. Have a good lunch.

(The jury left the courtroom, and the following proceedings were had.)

THE COURT: The record should reflect that both defendants are present, counsel for both defendants are present, counsel for the state is present. Argument has just been conducted relative to the 404(B) Evidence, and Court has been asked by the state to make a ruling. The

Court at this time based upon the status of the record at this time will not permit the introduction of any evidence in front of the jury to the effect that

Ms. Canen traded either legally or illegally obtained drugs for marijuana.

2.0

The reason the Court has embarked upon that ruling is this. Counsel for the state have indicated to me their evidence will reflect the proposition that cash money was taken being the basis of the robbery in the felony murder in this case and not illegal drugs. If no illegal drugs were taken or the state is not in a position to prove they were taken, it would appear to be to be problematic to permit this evidence to come in that the defendant traded drugs for a different type of illegal drugs.

Now, Ms. Becker points out there is a fingerprint on the drug container or a box in which the drug the containers were in. That can be tied up to Ms. Canen. That appears to me to be a horse of a completely different color, and it would appear to me that evidence might well be admissible. We'll see.

(A recess was taken at this time.)

(The Court convened with all the parties present. The jury entered the courtroom and the following

```
proceedings were had.)
 1
                THE COURT: Be seated, please. Ms. Becker, Mr.
 2
 3
      Williams, call your next witness.
                MS. BECKER: Thank you, Judge.
 4
                MR. WILLIAMS: State calls Matt Johnson. Raise
 5
      your right hand, sir.
 6
 7
                     (The witness was sworn.)
                THE WITNESS: I do.
 8
                THE COURT: Take the witness stand.
 9
10
                       JEROME MATTHEW JOHNSON
      called on behalf of the State, having been first duly
11
12
      sworn, testified as follows:
                         DIRECT EXAMINATION
13
14
      BY MR. WILLIAMS:
            Can you tell the jury your full name?
15
           Jerome M. Johnson.
16
17
            Do you go by Matt?
18
        A
           Yes.
            Matt, where do you live?
19
        Q
20
        Α
            Oaklawn Apartments.
            And how long have you been at Oaklawn?
21
        Q
            About three months I've been living there.
22
23
        Q
            Was there ever a time that you lived at the
24
            Waterfall Highrise Apartments?
            I lived there from October of '99 until January of
25
```

429 2002. 1 2 With regard to when you lived there, were you living there on Thanksgiving of 2002? 3 А Yes. 4 So when you said that you were living there as 5 Q of -- until January of 2002, is that correct? 6 7 Yes. Α Are you sure? 0 8 9 Α Yeah. 10 Q I mean, phrase it this way. Were you living at the Waterfall Highrise Apartments as of November 28, 11 12 2002? 13 Α Yeah. I lived there until January of 2003. 14 Q All right. 15 Α Sorry. 16 Q That's okay. Do you remember what apartment you 17 were in? 1009. 18 Α Was that on the tenth floor? 19 Q 20 Α Yes. Did you know -- strike that. Did you live alone? 21 Q 22 Α Yes. 23 Q And did you know a woman by the name of Helen 24 Sailor? 25 Α Yes.

- 430 0 How did you know her? 1 She lived about four doors down from me on the 2 Α 3 tenth floor. Had you ever talked with Helen? 4 Q 5 Α I opened a jar of relish for her at one time. Do you remember when that was in relation to 6 Q 7 Thanksgiving of 2002? About -- about a year before. Α 8 9 Q Now, do you know a person by the name of Andrew 10 Royer? 11 Α Yes. 12 Do you see Andrew Royer in the courtroom today? 13 Α Yes. 14 Can you point out where he is seated and what he is wearing? 15 16 He's sitting next to the gentleman in the brown 17 tweed jacket with glasses on. MR. WILLIAMS: Will the record reflect, Judge, 18 that the witness has identified the defendant Andrew 19 20 Royer? THE COURT: The record will so reflect. 21 BY MR. WILLIAMS: 22 23 Matt, did you know a person by the name -- or do
 - [8/8/2005] 20050809CanenRoyer

you know a person by the name of Lana Canen?

24

25

Α

Yes.

431 0 And do you see Lana Canen in the courtroom today? 1 Α 2 Yes. 3 Q Can you point out where she is seated and what she is wearing? 4 She's sitting at the end of the table in a pink 5 Α shirt. 6 7 MR. WILLIAMS: Again, Judge, may the record reflect that the witness has identified Lana Canen? 8 THE COURT: The record will so reflect. 9 10 BY MR. WILLIAMS: Now, Matt, I want to take you back to Thanksgiving 11 12 day of June of 2002. Do you recall what you did 13 that day? 14 Α I had Thanksgiving dinner with my sister. Who is your sister? 15 0 Martha Haff. 16 Α 17 0 What did you eat for dinner? Ham, vegetables. 18 Α Did you do anything else that day? 19 Q 20 Α Pretty much stayed in my room, went down to the lobby a couple times and got some pop. 21 Now, was your sister staying with you? 22 Q 23 Α Yes. 24 0 When did she arrive at your apartment?

25

Α

The night before.

- 1 Q So the night before Thanksgiving she came over.
- 2 A Yeah. She spent the night.
- Q Now, on the evening of Thanksgiving, do you remember having any visitors?
 - A I think Lana and Andy stopped by. Andy was going to spend Thanksqiving with his mom.
 - Q All right. And in the evening hours, do you remember anybody coming by other than Lana and possibly Andy?
 - A No. I think that's it.
- 11 Q Was there a time in which you went to sleep that 12 night?
- 13 A I think I took a nap that afternoon.
- Q And in the evening hours, did you go to bed?
- 15 A Yeah. About a 11.
- Q Do you remember a knock at a door?
- 17 A I -- at that time I didn't remember because I was
 18 sleeping. Andy knocked about midnight, and I let
 19 him in and told him he could visit with my sister,
 20 but I was going to go back to bed.
- Q So there was a knock at the door and you answered
- 23 A Yes.

it.

5

6

7

8

9

- 24 Q Martha was there. Why didn't she answer the door?
- 25 A She's not allowed to answer my door.

- 1 Q Why is that?
- 2 A Because people -- somebody's been stealing stuff
- from people in the building and odd things had been
- 4 going on lately.
- 5 Q Now, your sister is Martha. Is that correct?
- 6 A Yeah.
- 7 Q Now, does she have any mental conditions, your
- 8 sister?
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q What is that?
- 11 A I'm not sure of her exact diagnosis, but she's also
- 12 a patient at Oaklawns.
- 13 Q Now, you said that you went to the door and you let
- Mr. Royer in.
- 15 A Yeah.
- Q Is that correct? Did you talk with him at all?
- 17 A Just besides what I told him about visiting with my
- 18 sister. I went back to bed.
- 19 Q Now, had Andy Royer visited your apartment before?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Q Did he normally come over that late at night?
- 22 A No.
- 23 Q Now, when did you -- did you find out at some point
- 24 that Helen Sailor had been murdered?
- 25 A Emma Cox told me in the lobby Friday night.

- Q Is this Friday night the night of Thanksgiving?
- A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

22

23

24

25

- Q Now, do you remember having a conversation about the murder?
 - A Me and my sister was discussing it that following Monday I think it was. Andy and Lana were there.
 - Q And where were you at?
 - A In my apartment.
 - Q Did you say anything about the murder?
 - A Me and my sister was talking about it, and Andy and
 Lana didn't comment at all about it so I changed
 the subject because I thought they felt
 uncomfortable.

MR. ZOOK: Objection, your Honor. When he says he thought they felt something.

THE COURT: It would call for a conclusion or speculation on the part of the witness. The jury will disregard the answer just given by the witness. You want to rephrase your question, Mr. Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, you Honor.

21 BY MR. WILLIAMS:

- Q You had a conversation with your sister about Helen
 Sailor's murder. Is that right?
- A Yes.
- Q And Lana and Andy were present?

Α Yes. 1 When you were talking about that, what did Lana and 3 Andy do? MR. CRAWFORD: Objection. Asked and answered, 4 5 your Honor. THE WITNESS: Just more or less stared at the 6 7 floor --THE COURT: Wait a minute. Hold on. Hold on 8 9 just a minute. 10 MR. CRAWFORD: I believe he's already answered that portion of the question already. 11 12 THE COURT: It was stricken from the record at 13 the request of Mr. Zook. 14 MR. CRAWFORD: The latter part of it I believe. 15 THE COURT: Well, if it has been, then it would 16 be cumulative and nonerror. Your objection is overruled. 17 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank your, your Honor. BY MR. WILLIAMS: 18 What did Andy and Lana do when you were talking 19 2.0 about this? Just stared at the floor. Didn't make any 21 Α 22 comments. 23 Now, how long have you known Andy Royer? 24 Α I met Andy at Oaklawn about a year before he moved 25 into the highrise.

- Q So as of today, how long is that -- how long have you known him, do you know?

 A About five years.
 - Q And when he lived at the Waterfall Highrise

 Apartments, were you friends?
- 6 A Yes.

- 7 Q Now, how long have you known Lana Canen?
- 8 A I met her about six weeks before Helen's death.
- 9 Q And did you meet her at the Waterfall Highrise
 10 Apartments?
- 11 A Yeah.
- 12 Q Now, did Andy and Lana both live there?
- 13 A Yes.
- Q And when I say "there," I mean the Waterfall
 Highrise Apartments?
- 16 A Yes.
- Q Were they friends?
- A Sherrie Miller brought Lana up to my apartment, and that's where she met Andy at, and they became
- 20 friends after that.
- Q Did you ever see them together after that?
- 22 A Lots of times.
- Q Did Andy ever tell you what he thought of Lana?
- 24 A He felt attracted to her --
- MR. ZOOK: Objection. Hearsay.

```
THE COURT: Hold it. It would be hearsay,
 1
      would it not?
 2
 3
                MR. WILLIAMS: It's an admission, Judge, by a
 4
      party opponent.
 5
                THE COURT: Statement of a party opponent.
                MR. WILLIAMS: I'm asking what Andy --
 6
 7
                THE COURT: It would be a statement of a party
      opponent. The objection will be overruled.
 8
                MR. WILLIAMS: May I proceed, your Honor?
 9
10
                THE COURT: You may.
      BY MR. WILLIAMS:
11
12
            I'm going to rephrase that or ask the question
13
            again. Did Andy ever tell you what he thought of
14
            Lana?
            He told me one time in his own words that he'd like
15
16
            to jump her bones.
17
        Q
            Now, were you contacted by the police regarding
            Helen Sailor's murder?
18
19
        Α
           Yes.
20
        Q
            And were you interviewed? Were you interviewed by
            the police?
21
22
            Yes.
23
            And did you cooperate with their investigation?
24
        Α
           Yes.
25
                MR. WILLIAMS: Nothing further, your Honor.
```

		430	
1		THE COURT: Mr. Zook.	
2		MR. ZOOK: Thank you.	
3		CROSS-EXAMINATION	
4	BY MR	. ZOOK:	
5	Q	Matt, when did you live there again in the	
6		Waterfall Apartments?	
7	A	(No response.)	
8	Q	When did you live at the Waterfall apartments, from	
9		when to when?	
10	A	(No response.)	
11	Q	When did you live in the Waterfall Apartments?	
12	A	From '99 until January of last year, the year	
13		before last.	
14	Q	Okay. Did you have any duties while you were	
15		there?	
16	A	Could you repeat that?	
17	Q	Did you have any duties while you were at the	
18		Waterfall Apartments?	
19	A	No. I was just a resident.	
20	Q	Okay. And this person that lived with you or was	
21		staying with you, who was she again?	
22	A	My sister.	
23	Q	Your sister.	
24	A	She would visit me.	
25	Q	You need to keep in front of the microphone.	

- 1 A She would visit me from Mondays till Wednesdays.
- Q Okay. Are you having problems seeing me?
- 3 A No. I have a hard time hearing.
- Q Okay. So she would live with you Mondays through
- Wednesdays.
- 6 A On average, yes.
- 7 Q Okay. And she had another place to stay also.
- 8 A She was living at Oaklawn Apartments at the time.
- 9 Q Okay. Back in 2002, November of 2002, were you on
- 10 any medication?
- 11 A Was I?
- 12 Q Yes.
- 13 A Yes, sir.
- 14 Q What would that have been?
- 15 A Depakote, respridol and Paxil.
- Q Okay. And what was your condition that that was
- 17 prescribed for?
- 18 A My condition.
- 19 Q Yes.
- 20 A Normal/average.
- 21 Q Normal/average?
- 22 A About just average day, average.
- 23 Q I mean, what was your medical condition that you
- 24 were taking the --
- 25 A Bipolar disorder and anxiety.

			440
1	Q	All right. Thank you.	
2		MR. ZOOK: No further questions.	
3		THE COURT: Mr. Crawford, any questions?	
4		MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, your Honor.	
5		CROSS-EXAMINATION	
6	BY MR	R. CRAWFORD:	
7	Q	Just want to make sure I'm clear. Mr. Johnson, you	
8		were friends of Andy's for a friend of Andy's	
9		for about how long, about a year and a half, two	
10		years?	
11	A	Between four and five years. I didn't really	
12		become his friend until after he moved into the	
13		highrise.	
14	Q	You spent some time together while the two of you	
15		were at the highrise?	
16	A	Yeah. And drank coffee and stuff.	
17	Q	Was he a frequent visitor of your place?	
18	A	Yeah.	
19	Q	Consider yourself to be pretty good friends?	
20	A	Not real close. Just more like acquaintance	
21		because of our our relationship to Oaklawn.	
22	Q	Okay. So you mentioned that you were a patient at	
23		Oaklawn. Is that correct?	
24	A	Yes.	
25	Q	And you were receiving treatment for anxiety	

```
attacks and bipolar condition. Is that correct?
 1
 2
        Α
            Yes.
 3
        Q
            And you were on medication. Is that correct?
        А
            Yes.
 4
            Without the medication, would you ever be violent?
 5
            Would you ever be violent if you were not using the
 6
 7
            medication?
                MR. WILLIAMS: Objection, your Honor.
 8
                THE WITNESS: Could you repeat that?
 9
10
                THE COURT: Hold on a moment. Counsel,
11
      approach.
12
                      (An off-the-record discussion was held
13
                     at the bench.)
                THE COURT: The Court will permit -- the
14
      objection will be sustained. The Court will permit
15
      Mr. Crawford to call this witness in his own case at any
16
      time of his choosing if he wishes to explore this issue.
17
      Mr. Crawford, any other questions?
18
19
                MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, your Honor, thank you.
2.0
      BY MR. CRAWFORD:
            You had mentioned that you met Lana about six weeks
21
            prior to this particular incident. Is that
22
23
            correct?
24
        Α
            Meeting Lana?
25
        0
            Yes.
```

- 442 Α Yes. 1 And how often did you visit with her about --2 3 during the period of time in the six weeks up to the point of Ms. Sailor's death? 4 She'd come over to my apartment average three or 5 Α four times a week. I think I went over to her 6 7 apartment probably four times at the most. Okay. During the periods of time that you would 0 8 visit with Lana, was it always -- was Andy always 9 10 with you or were there periods of time that you visited with her alone? 11 12 Most of the time. Α 13 Most of the time he was there? 14 Α Yes. But there were periods of time that you visited 15 0 alone with her as well? 16 17 Α Could you repeat that? Were times that just you visited with her that Andy 18 Q was not present? 19 20 Α Sometimes, not too often. Okay. Now, I believe you mentioned that you were 21 Q contacted by the police in this case. Is that 22
 - Q And you did cooperate with them?

correct?

Yes, sir.

23

24

25

Α

STATE'S WITNESS - JEROME MATTHEW JOHNSON - (REDIRECT)

A Yes.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

- Q Were you required -- or did they ask you to give fingerprints as well?
- A Did they ask me what?
 - Q To take your fingerprints?
 - A They took my picture and my fingerprints, gave me a voice stress analyzer test, and took pictures of my shoes.
- MR. CRAWFORD: Okay. No further questions, your Honor.
- 11 THE COURT: Redirect.
- 12 MR. WILLIAMS: Briefly, Judge.
- 13 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
- 14 BY MR. WILLIAMS:
 - Q Mr. Johnson, you said you were taking some medication for your condition. Is that correct?
- 17 A Yes.
- Q And were you taking that medication in November of 2002?
- 20 A Yes.
- MR. WILLIAMS: No further questions, your
- 22 Honor.
- THE COURT: Mr. Zook.
- MR. ZOOK: No questions.
- THE COURT: Mr. Crawford.

```
STATE'S WITNESS - JEROME MATTHEW JOHNSON - (REDIRECT)
 1
                MR. CRAWFORD: No further questions, your
 2
      Honor.
                THE COURT: You may step down, sir. Watch your
 3
      step, please. Is he released from his subpoena at this
 4
      time from the state?
                MS. BECKER: Yes, your Honor.
 6
 7
                THE COURT: Mr. Crawford, yes/no.
                MR. CRAWFORD: At this time, no, your Honor.
 8
                THE COURT: All right. Mr. Johnson, you'll be
 9
      held on your subpoena. Mr. Crawford's office will
10
11
      contact you if you are needed. You must remain available
      if you're called back to testify. Do you understand?
12
13
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
14
                THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Call your next
15
      witness.
16
                MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, the state will call
17
      Martha Haff.
                THE COURT: Would you raise your right hand.
18
19
                     (The witness was sworn.)
20
                THE WITNESS: I do.
21
                THE COURT: Take the witness stand, please.
22
      1111
     1///
23
     1111
24
25
      1111
```

1		MARTHA HAFF
2	calle	d on behalf of the State, having been first duly
3	sworn	, testified as follows:
4		DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY MR	. WILLIAMS:
6	Q	Can you tell the jury your name?
7	А	(No response.)
8	Q	Can you tell the jury your name?
9	A	(No response.)
10	Q	Martha, could can you introduce yourself to the
11		jury?
12	А	I'm Martha Haff.
13	Q	And, Martha, where do you live?
14	A	Elkhart.
15	Q	How long have you lived in Elkhart?
16	A	How long?
17	Q	How long?
18	A	Maybe for about 30 years.
19	Q	Do you have a brother?
20	А	Matt Johnson.
21	Q	Do you visit Matt?
22	A	Huh?
23	Q	Do you visit Matt?
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	I want to take you back to November 28 of 2002,

which was Thanksqiving Day. Do you remember what 1 you did that day? 2 3 Α Huh? Do you remember what you did on Thanksgiving Day of 4 2002? 5 I got up, and I went to the lobby. 6 7 Where were you? Q At the Waterfalls. Α 8 Is that the Waterfall Highrise Apartments? 9 Q 10 Α Uh-huh. What were you doing there? 11 Q 12 Visiting my brother. Α 13 Q Did your brother live at the Waterfall Highrise? On the tenth floor. 14Α Now, you said you went to the lobby. Do you 15 0 remember if you did anything else that day? 16 I went to the lobby, and I saw Andy down there in 17 Α the lobby waiting for a ride from his mother I 18 think. 19 20 Do you remember what time that was? Q It was pretty early in the morning. 21 Α At some point did you leave the lobby? 22 23 I think I did when he left. Α 24 Q Did you have Thanksgiving dinner? The people downstairs -- I think I brought in stuff 25 Α

from the Faith Mission. 1 So you had Thanksgiving dinner that day. 2 I didn't; my brother did. 3 Α Now, you said your brother lived on the tenth floor 4 Q of the apartment building. Do you remember if anybody came over on Thanksgiving night? 6 7 I think Andy did. Α Now, did you know Andrew Royer back then? 8 Uh-huh. 9 Д 10 0 Do you see Andy in the courtroom today? Do you see Andy in the courtroom today? Is that yes or a no? 11 12 Do you see him in the courtroom today? 13 Α Yes. 14 Can you point out where he's seated and what he's wearing? 15 16 He's wearing glasses, and it looks like he's got a Α haircut. 17 And where is he seated. 18 Right there between those two quys? 19 2.0 MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, may the record reflect that the witness has identified Andy Royer. 21 THE COURT: The record will so reflect. 22 23 BY MR. WILLIAMS: 24 Now, you said that you thought that Andy came by that night. Do you know if he came by? 25

- 448 Α It was about eleven o'clock. Matt was already in 1 bed, and I was watching a movie on cable TV. 2 And how did Andy come to the apartment? 3 Q I think he walked up in the elevator. 4 Α Did he walk in? 5 Q Uh-huh. 6 Α 7 Did he have to knock on the door? Q I think he knocked. Α 8 Do you remember who answered the door? 9 Q 10 Α I think I did. Are you sure? 11 Q 12 Α It seems like it. 13 Q Now, were you allowed to open your brother's door back then? Were you allowed to open your brother's 14 door when you lived with him? 15 16 Not really. He got mad when I did that. Α 17 Now, you said Andy stopped by, and you were watching a movie, and this was about eleven 18 o'clock. How long did Andy stay at the apartment? 19 20 Till about one; I think about two hours. Α And did Andy say anything to you while he was 21 0 there? 22 23 No. He was awful quiet. Α
 - [8/8/2005] 20050809CanenRoyer

Now, after Andy left around one o'clock, what did

24

25

0

you do?

STATE'S WITNESS - MARTHA HAFF - (CROSS)

- A When Matt got up to -- to lock the door, and he said, "What the hell is he doing here so late?"
 - Q And then what did you do?
- A I think I laid on the couch and went to sleep cause it was awful late, and I was tired cause I had to get up in the morning to leave.
 - Q Were you going -- were you going back somewhere after -- in the morning?
- A I went back home.
- MR. WILLIAMS: No further questions, your
- Honor.

1

2

4

6

7

8

- 12 THE COURT: Mr. Zook, any questions.
- MR. ZOOK: Yes.
- 14 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 15 BY MR. ZOOK:
- 16 Q Hi.
- 17 A Hi.
- Q Did you say that Matt had cable TV there?
- 19 A Uh-huh.
- 20 Q Okay. Thank you.
- 21 THE COURT: Mr. Crawford, any questions.
- 22 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, your Honor. Just briefly.
- 23 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 24 BY MR. CRAWFORD:
- 25 Q Ms. Haff, you mentioned that Andy had gotten there

```
STATE'S WITNESS - MARTHA HAFF - (CROSS)
 1
            about eleven o'clock. Was that correct?
            (No response.)
 2
        Α
        0
            And you mentioned --
                THE COURT: Okay. Hold on a minute. You have
 4
 5
      to answer out loud so we can record what you're saying.
 6
      Could you give your answer out loud?
 7
        Α
            Yes.
            And you mentioned that he left about one o'clock.
 8
        0
            Is that correct?
 9
            Yes.
10
        Α
            So you mentioned he stayed there for two hours.
11
12
        Α
            Yes.
            And during that period of time I believe you
13
        0
14
            mentioned that he was awfully quiet. Is that
            correct?
15
16
        Α
            Yes.
17
        Q
            Is that uncommon for Andy, or is Andy a quiet
18
            person?
            Seems like a quiet person.
19
20
                MR. CRAWFORD: No further questions, your
      Honor.
              Thank you.
21
                THE COURT: Anybody have any additional
22
23
      questions?
24
                MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor.
                THE COURT: You may step down. Watch your
25
```

```
step, please. Is she released on her subpoena?
 1
                MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, your Honor.
 2
 3
                MR. ZOOK: Yes, sir.
                MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir.
 4
 5
                THE COURT: She's released. Call your next
 6
      witness.
 7
                MR. WILLIAMS: State calls Terri Walker.
                THE COURT: Raise your right hand.
 8
                      (The witness was sworn.)
 9
10
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
                THE COURT: Take the witness stand, please.
11
12
                            TERRI WALKER
13
      called on behalf of the State, having been first duly
14
      sworn, testified as follows:
15
                         DIRECT EXAMINATION
16
      BY MR. WILLIAMS:
17
            Could you please introduce yourself to the jury?
            My name is Terri Walker.
18
        Α
            Ms. Walker, where do you work?
19
        Q
20
        Α
            For the Elkhart Housing Authority.
        0
            And how long have you been working for the Elkhart
21
            Housing Authority?
22
23
            For 20 years.
        Α
24
        0
            What is your current position?
            I'm a director of public housing management.
25
```

- Q And how long have you been in that position as the director of public housing management?
 - A Over eight years.
- Q So you were the director of the Public Housing
 Management as of November 28, 2002.
- A Yes, I was.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- Q Now, what is the Elkhart County Housing Authority?
 - A The Housing Authority is a government program that provides housing -- subsidized housing for low to moderate income families.
- Q And what are your duties as the director of the housing portion of the organization?
- A I oversee the management division that leases the apartment and maintains development and handle all tenant issues.
- Q Now, you said developments. Do you have a number of developments that you manage?
- 18 A Yes. We have five different developments.
- 19 Q And do you manage all five of those?
- 20 A Yes, we do.
- Q Do you manage only those -- those developments in Elkhart County?
- 23 A Yes.
- Q Specifically, is that the city of Elkhart?
- 25 A Yes.

- Q Is one of the developments that you manage the
 Waterfall Highrise Apartments in Elkhart?
 - A That's correct.

- 4 Q And what's the specific address to that location?
- 5 A 303 Waterfall Drive.
- Q Now, can anyone live in the Waterfall Highrise
 Apartments?
- 8 A You must be income eliqible and over the age of 18.
- 9 Q So there's some criteria you have to meet to move in.
- 11 A Correct.
- 12 Q Anything else other than income and age?
- 13 A Elderly, disabled, and handicapped is also a criteria.
- 2 So you have to be over the age of 18, income dependent, and either elderly or mentally or physically handicapped.
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q And that was the criteria back in November of 2002.
- 20 A Correct.
- Q Do people that live at the Highrise receive public assistance?
- 23 A Yes. They are eligible for public assistance, yes.
- Q Now, are you the custodian of records for the
- 25 organization?

- 1 A Yes, I am.
- Q And have you reviewed some records for your testimony today regarding Andrew Royer, Lana Canen,
- 4 and Helen Sailor?
- 5 A Yes, I have.
 - Q What records did you review?
- 7 A I reviewed records for Helen Sailor. I -- I
 8 reviewed the move in and move out dates and
 9 reviewed her -- the address that she resided in.
 - Q Did you do that also for Andrew Royer and Lana
 Canen?
- 12 A Yes.

10

- 13 Q Now, are these records that you reviewed in -- that
 14 are kept in the normal course of the business of
 15 the housing authority?
- 16 A Yes, they are.
- Q I want to speak specifically about Helen Sailor
 first. Did she live at the Waterfall Highrise
 Apartments as of November 28, 2002?
- 20 A Yes, she did.
- 21 Q Do you remember when she moved in?
- A Yes. She -- our records show that her move in date
 was October 14, 1997.
- Q And she stopped living there as of November 28 of 2002.

- 1 A That's correct.
- 2 Q What apartment was she in?
- 3 A She was in 1002.
- 4 Q And is 1002 on the tenth floor?
- 5 A Yes, it is.
- 6 Q With respect to Lana Canen, was she living at the
- 7 Waterfall Highrise Apartments as of November 28,
- 8 2002?
- 9 A Yes, she was.
- 10 Q And what was her move in date?
- 11 A Here move in date was June 15, 1998.
- 12 Q And her move out date?
- 13 A April 1, 2003.
- 14 Q What apartment was she in?
- 15 A Apartment 802.
- 16 Q Was she in that apartment during the entire
- duration of while she was living at the Waterfall
- 18 Highrise Apartments?
- 19 A Yes, I believe so.
- 20 Q And again was that -- would that be on the eighth
- 21 floor?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q So the numbers go 802 is on the eighth floor, 1002
- 24 is on the tenth floor.
- 25 A That's correct.

```
With respect to Andrew Royer, was he living at the
 1
            Waterfall Highrise Apartments as of November 28,
 2
 3
            2002?
            Yes.
 4
        Α
 5
        Q
            And, again, what was his move in date?
            Andrew's move in date was December 17, 2001.
 6
        Α
 7
            And what was his move out date?
        Q
            October 30, 2003.
        Α
 8
            What apartment did he live in?
 9
        Q
10
        A
            Apartment 507.
            And that would have been on the fifth floor.
11
12
        Α
            Correct.
13
                MR. WILLIAMS: No further questions, your
14
      Honor.
15
                THE COURT: Mr. Zook.
16
                MR. ZOOK: No questions.
17
                THE COURT: Mr. Crawford.
                MR. CRAWFORD: No questions, your Honor.
18
                THE COURT: You may step down. Watch your
19
      step, please. Call your next witness.
20
                MS. BECKER: Thank you. The State of Indiana
21
      would call Charlie Lambert.
22
23
                THE COURT: Would you raise your right hand,
24
      please, sir.
25
                     (The witness was sworn.)
```

1		THE WITNESS: I do.
2		THE COURT: Thank you.
3		CHARLIE LAMBERT
4	called	d on behalf of the State, having been first duly
5	sworn	, testified as follows:
6		DIRECT EXAMINATION
7	BY MS	. BECKER:
8	Q	Sir, would you please introduce yourself to our
9		jury?
10	A	I'm Charlie Lambert.
11	Q	Mr. Lambert, where do you live right now?
12	A	I live out at Overlook Apartments on 19.
13	Q	Is that here in Elkhart County?
14	A	Yes. Just outside the city limits.
15	Q	Outside the city of Elkhart?
16	A	Yeah. Just barely outside the city.
17	Q	Okay. Where did you live in November of 2002?
18	A	I was living at Overlook.
19	Q	Okay. Same place you are now?
20	A	Yeah.
21	Q	Prior to living at the Overlook, where did you
22		live?
23	A	I lived at Waterfall Highrise fifth floor.
24	Q	We're having trouble hearing you a little bit.
25	A	I'm sorry.

- 0 That's okay. If you could just speak as loud as 1 you can so we can all hear you. Did you indicate 2 3 you lived at the Waterfall? Yes, I did. 4 Α How long did you live at the Waterfall Highrise? 5 Q About four and a half years. 6 Α 7 Do you recall when you moved there? Q Vaguely. Α 8
- 9 Q Do you recall when you moved out?
- 10 A It was September of 2001.
- Q Okay. So in September of 2001, is that when you moved to the Overlook?
- 13 A Yes.

18

19

- Q Did you still maintain some friendships with individuals who lived at the Waterfall?
- 16 A Yeah, one or two.
 - Q One or two. I'd like to draw your attention to
 November 28 of 2002, that would be Thursday,
 Thanksgiving Day of 2002. All right. First of
 all, where were you during the day that day?
- 21 A I was between home and then my relatives up in 22 Michigan.
- Q Okay. Whereabouts in Michigan were you relatives located?
- 25 A Adamsville.

- Q What did you do at your relatives that day?
- 2 A We had a family dinner, you know, socializing.
- Q Do you recall what time you left your relative's house in Michigan?
- 3
- 5 A Somewhere between probably six and quarter after.
- Q On your way home that evening, did you make any stops?
- 8 A One.

- 9 Q Where?
- 10 A It was at the Highrise.
- 11 Q Why did you stop that Highrise Thanksgiving
 12 evening?
- A I'm not really sure other than to see some friends.
- Q Okay. Did you feel like visiting a little bit?
- 15 A Yeah. I was in no rush to get home.
- Q Okay. Was it a holiday kind of making you feel
- 17 warm?
- 18 A Yeah.
- Q All right. When -- who specifically were you
- 20 hoping to see at the highrise?
- 21 A I think it might have been Randy.
- Q Okay. Do you remember Randy's last name?
- 23 A Skofferland (phonetic).
- 24 Q Do you recall what time it was when you got to the
- 25 highrise that evening?

- 1 A Probably 25 after, 6:30.
- Q How long did it take to get to the highrise from your relatives in Michigan?
 - A About 15, maybe a few more minutes.
 - Q So it was pretty close. When you got to highrise,
 where did you -- well, first of all, how did you
 get there? What kind of vehicle did you use?
 - A I was driving a Toyota Camry at the time.
 - Q When you arrived, where did you park your car?
 - A In one of the visitor's spots in one of the handicap areas I think.
- Q Well, did you have anyone with you at the time?
- 13 A Nope.

5

6

7

8

9

10

- Q Did you see anyone outside walking around when you arrived?
- 16 A One person.
- 17 | O Who was that?
- 18 A The defendant there, Lana.
- Q Okay. You just identified someone as Lana and then used your finger to point. First of all, you're
- going to have to speak up a little bit more.
- 22 Sorry. How do you know a person by the name of
- 23 Lana?
- 24 A I met her when I was living there.
- 25 Q Living where?

- 1 A At Waterfall.
- Q Okay. And when you refer to Lana, do you know her
- 3 last name?

6

7

8

9

10

19

2.0

- A I do, but I'm not sure how to pronounce it.
- Q Okay. How do you -- do your best shot?
 - A Canon I would assume.
 - Q Okay. Do you see -- you've indicated you see her in the courtroom today. Would you describe what she is wearing so that the record knows who you're talking about it?
- 11 A It looks like a pink blouse.
- 12 Q Okay. Where is she seated in the courtroom?
- 13 A Over here to my left.
- MS. BECKER: To your left. Would the record

 please reflect this witness has identified the defendant
- 16 Lana Canen.
- 17 THE COURT: The record will so reflect.
- 18 BY MS. BECKER:
 - Q As you drove up, parked your car, and saw the defendant Lana Canen outside the highrise, did you stop and talk to her at that point?
- 22 A Probably for a couple minutes.
- Q Okay. What did you do next?
- 24 A I went inside, signed in.
- 25 Q Did you visit with anyone while you were inside?

- 1 A Yeah. There was some people in the TV room.
- 2 Q Do you remember who you spoke to in the TV room?
- 3 A Maybe one, and she has since past on.
- 4 Q Okay. Do you know someone by the name of Flo
- 5 Macioce?
- 6 A Yes, I do.
- Q Do you remember if you saw her in the TV room when you got there?
- 9 A No, I don't.
- 10 Q No you didn't see her, or no you don't remember?
- 11 A I don't remember.
- 12 Q Where did you go from the TV room?
- 13 A I might have talked to a of couple ladies that were
 14 in the laundry room.
- 15 Q Did you see your friend Randy?
- A I don't believe he was there now that I think about
- 17 it.
- 18 Q At some point, then, did you leave the Highrise?
- 19 A Yes, I did.
- 20 Q What did you do when you left the Highrise?
- 21 A The more I think about it, I -- I probably took
- 22 somebody somewhere.
- Q Who did you take somewhere?
- 24 A Once again, it would have been the defendant.
- 25 Q I'm sorry. I can't hear you.

- 1 A I'm sorry. It would have been the defendant.
- Q Okay. Which defendant are we talking about?
- 3 A Lana.

10

11

- Q Lana. Where did you take Lana after you left the highrise?
 - A Over off Oslo and Bristol Road to her boyfriends.
- Q Any idea what time of day it was when you drove the defendant over to Oslo?
- 9 A Probably somewhere between quarter of and seven.
 - Q And when you say quarter of, you're referring quarter till seven, seven o'clock?
- 12 A Yes.
- Q Okay. How was Lana behaving when you left the highrise and still saw her outside?
- 15 A I'd have to say probably normal like anybody else,
 16 you know, just hanging out there, you know, whether
 17 it's just to relax. I don't know.
 - Q What did you see her doing?
- 19 A When I drove up?
- 20 Q Yes.
- A Like, standing right at the main entrance, went to
 the east end of the building like she was looking
 around the corner, and did the same going to the
 west.
- Q Okay. How many times did you observe her do that?

- 1 A At least two each way.
- Q Okay. After you came out of the highrise from
 being inside visiting, was she still walking back
 and forth?
- 5 A No. She was waiting to talk to me again.
- Q And when you came out, did you stop and talk to her?
- 8 A Yeah.
- 9 Q Did she ask you any questions?
- 10 A If I could take her somewhere.
- 11 Q And did you agree to do that?
- 12 A Yes.
- Q Did you drive your car to do that?
- 14 A Yes.
- 15 Q Anybody else leave with you?
- 16 A No.
- 17 Q Do you know if anybody saw you leave?
- 18 A If there was anybody down in the -- in the -- the
 19 main entrance area, it would have been somebody
 20 from there if anybody; and possibly the people in
- 21 the TV room.
- Q Okay. Did you and the defendant, Lana Canen, talk
 at all between the time you left the highrise until
 the time you got out to Bristol and Oslo Road?
- 25 A I'm sure we did.

465 Do you recall what the conversation was about? 1 No. She was just trying to describe to me how to 2 Α get out to where I was taking her. That's the only 3 thing I can say. 4 Did you talk about anything else? 5 Q I have no recollection of that. 6 7 Was there anything about the way she was behaving Q while you were driving that made you uncomfortable? 8 9 Д No. 10 MR. ZOOK: Objection, your Honor. This is 11 leading. 12 THE COURT: Well --13 MS. BECKER: It doesn't suggest an answer. 14 THE COURT: I'm not sure it's leading. His answer was no. Do you want the answer stricken or --15 MR. ZOOK: No. I'm withdrawing my objection. 16 17 THE COURT: You're withdrawing your objection. All right. 18 BY MS. BECKER: 19 2.0 Do you recall whether the defendant, Lana Canen, had anything with her in her hands while you saw 21 her when you took her out to --22 23 One large duffel bag I'd say about that long about 24 that high. Okay. So the record reflects what your hands were 25

466 just doing, how wide would you say your fingers 1 2 were apart? 3 Α Between 18 and 20 inches. And how tall were you reflecting? 4 Q 5 Maybe between four to six or maybe taller. Α Do you recall what color that bag was? 6 7 Black, white and red. Α Had you seen that bag before or a bag like it? 0 8 I had seen one like it. 9 Α 10 0 Okay. What kind of a bag would you characterize it 11 as? 12 It's one of those special offer duffel bags. Α 13 Q From what company? 14 It was from Marlboro. Okay. After you took Lana out to Bristol and Oslo 15 0 16 Road somewhere around 6:45, 7:00 o'clock p.m. that 17 night, a few days later did you come back to the highrise? 18 I might have. 19 Α 20 Do you recall speaking to Flo Macioce in the Q laundry room? 21 Yes, I do. 22 Α 23 Okay. What did you say to Flo Macioce? Q 24 Α We were talking about what had transpired.

Okay. What did you say to her, do you remember?

25

Q

- A Other than I was surprised to see what had happened.

 What are you referring to?
- 4 A The passing of Helen.
- 5 Q What else do you remember talking to Flow about?
- A I had made a statement to her saying I -- I guess I
 wish I hadn't got involved but yet I was.
- 8 Q What do you mean by that?
- 9 A That I had showed up there that night and took the defendant out to her boyfriend's.
- 11 Q Who are you referring to?
- 12 A Lana.
- Q Did Lana say anything to you on that trip that made you nervous?
- 15 A I am -- I'm not sure but I -- on that.
- Q Okay. A few days later you're talking to Flo, do
 you remember what else you said to her?
- 18 A No, I don't.
- 19 Q Do you remember asking her about keys?
- 20 A About what?
- 21 Q Keys.
- 22 A No.
- Q Okay. Do you remember asking Flo not to say anything about your taking Lana?
- MR. ZOOK: Objection, your Honor, this is

```
leading.
 1
                THE COURT: It is leading. Objection will be
 2
 3
      sustained.
      BY MS. BECKER:
 4
 5
            Do you remember saying anything else to Flo about
            Lana?
 6
 7
            No, I don't.
        Α
            Did you have any concern that someone had seen you
        0
 8
            drive Lana from the Waterfall?
 9
10
        Α
            I don't remember having any concern about who saw
11
            me.
12
                MS. BECKER: May I have just a moment, please.
13
                     (An off-the-record discussion was held
                     between counsel for the state.)
14
15
                MS. BECKER: No further questions. Thank you.
                THE COURT: Mr. Zook, any questions.
16
17
                          CROSS-EXAMINATION
      BY MR. ZOOK:
18
            Charles, do you remember what the weather was that
19
2.0
            evening, Thanksgiving evening when you gave Lana a
            ride?
21
            Probably a little bit on the cool side.
22
23
        Q
            Okay. Was it raining or not?
24
        Α
           No, it wasn't.
           It wasn't?
25
        0
```

- 469 No. I don't recall any rain. 1 Α Okay. Was it cloudy? 2 It could have been partly cloudy. 3 It could have been. 4 Yeah. I'm not for sure. Thank you. No more questions. 6 Q 7 THE COURT: Mr. Crawford. MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you, your Honor. 8 CROSS-EXAMINATION 9 10 BY MR. CRAWFORD: Charles, when you approached the highrise on 11 12 Thanksqiving, the only person you initially saw up 13 front was Lana Canen. Is that correct? 14 Α Yes. And the only person that got away -- or left with 15 0 you in the car was Lana Canen. Is that correct? 16 Yes, it is. 17 Α And you testify that at the time she left she had 18 0 some items with her. Is that correct? 19 20 А Yes. MR. CRAWFORD: No further questions, your 21 Honor. 22 23 MS. BECKER: No redirect.

step. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take a break.

24

25

THE COURT: You may step down, sir. Watch your

Once again, I need to remind you. You are all jurors in this case. I must tell you now and I will repeat this again each time you are permitted to separate.

2.0

Generally, you should not express any opinion about the case before it is submitted to you for deliberation; however, you are permitted to discuss the evidence presented in this case amongst yourselves in the jury room during recesses from trial. All jurors and alternates must be present during these discussions. You must reserve judgment about the outcome of the case until your deliberations begin.

You are admonished that you may not discuss the facts of the case with anyone other than your fellow jurors.

You may not discuss this case with me or with the lawyers, parties or with any of the witnesses.

You should not listen to or read any outside or media accounts of the trial. You may not investigate the case or attempt to obtain information outside the courtroom. It is highly improper for you to do so. You are to consider and decide this case only upon the evidence received during the course of the trial in the courtroom.

(A recess was taken at this time.)
(The Court convened with all the

1	parties present. The jury entered the
2	courtroom and the following
3	proceedings were had.)
4	THE COURT: Be seated, please. Call your next
5	witness.
6	MS. BECKER: Thank you, your Honor. The state
7	would call Florence Macioce.
8	THE COURT: Now, would you raise your right
9	hand, please.
10	(The witness was sworn.)
11	THE WITNESS: I do.
12	THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Becker.
13	FLORENCE MACIOCE
14	called on behalf of the State, having been first duly
15	sworn, testified as follows:
16	DIRECT EXAMINATION
17	BY MS. BECKER:
18	Q Good afternoon, ma'am. Would you please tell the
19	jury who you are?
20	A Florence Macioce.
21	Q Okay. Florence, where did you live in November of
22	2002?
23	A 303 Waterfall Drive, Apartment 812.
24	Q Is that also known as the Waterfall Highrise?
25	A Yes.

- 1 Q How long had you lived at the Waterfall Highrise by 2 that time?
 - A Seven years that time, but I lived there before.
- 4 Q Did you know someone by the name of Helen Sailor?
- 5 A Yes.

- 6 Q Okay. Were you friendly with Helen?
- 7 A Yes, we talked.
- Q The reason I want to draw your attention to

 Thanksgiving evening of 2002, I want to ask you

 about who you saw that evening. First of all, do

 you remember where you were during the day?
- 12 A Yes. I was at home, then I went downstairs in the lobby.
- Q Okay. Do you recall seeing Charlie Lambert that evening?
- 16 A Twice, yes.
- 17 Q How long had you known Charlie lambert?
- 18 A Approximately eight years.
- 19 Q Okay. Did you recognize him by sight?
- 20 A Yes.
- Q All right. Where did you see Charlie Lambert that night?
- A First in the elevator, and then when he came out into the lobby to go out the front door.
- Q Did you talk to Charlie Lambert at all?

- 1 A I said Hi, but he left.
 - Q Okay. So you didn't have a very long conversation.
- 3 A No.

- Q All right. Did there also come a time where you saw a person known as Lana Canen at the highrise?
- 6 A Yes.
- Q First of all, do you know someone by the name of Lana Canen?
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q Do you see that person in the courtroom today?
- 11 A Yes.
- Q Would you please describe what she is wearing and where she is seated so we all know who you're speaking of?
- 15 A In this, like, pinkish orangish top, sitting right
 16 over there with the long black hair.
- 17 Q All right. Is she seated off to your left?
- 18 A Yes.
- MS. BECKER: Would the record please reflect
 this witness has identified the defendant, Lana Canen?
- 21 THE COURT: The record will so reflect.
- 22 BY MS. BECKER:
- Q Did you also know a person by the name of Andrew Royer?
- 25 A Yes.

474 0 How do you know Andrew Royer? 1 He lived in the same building? 2 Α 3 Q Do you see Andrew Royer in the courtroom today? Yes. He's right there. He has glasses on and 4 А orange shirt with flowers or whatever. 5 Is he also off to your left? 6 7 Yes, correct. Α MS. BECKER: Would the record please reflect 8 this witness has identified the defendant, Andrew Royer. 9 10 THE COURT: The record will so reflect. BY MS. BECKER: 11 12 Q Now, when you saw the defendant Lana Canen at the 13 Waterfall Highrise, where was she? 14 Α On Thanksgiving evening you mean? On Thanksgiving evening. 15 0 Outside towards the left of the building. 16 Α What did you see Lana Canen doing outside on 17 0 Thanksqiving evening? 18 Just pacing. 19 Α 20 Did you actually sit there and watch her? Q No. I kind of seen her just walking by back and 21 Α forth. 22 23 After Charlie Lambert left that evening, did you 24 see Lana Canen any more?

25

Α

No.

- Q Now, Flo, I want to take you a couple weeks later.
 Were you still living at the highrise at that time?
 - A Yes.

6

7

9

12

13

20

21

- Q Did you come into contact with Charlie Lambert
 again at that time?
 - A It's about approximately four weeks later.
 - Q About four weeks later.
- 8 A Yes.
 - Q Where were you located when that happened?
- 10 A I was coming out of the elevator going towards the
 11 lobby to go out.
 - Q Okay. Where is the laundry room located?
 - A As soon as you get off the elevator directly ahead.
- Q Okay. Was it in that general vicinity where you ran into Charlie Lambert?
- 16 A Yes. They call it -- Charlie was sitting in the
 17 laundry room, and there was another resident. They
 18 called me into the laundry room. I had a
 19 conversation with Charlie.
 - Q Okay. I'm going to ask you about the conversation you had with Charlie. Did Charlie ask you any questions?
- 23 A After -- after he told me --
- MR. ZOOK: Objection, your Honor. This is getting into hearsay at this point.

```
THE COURT: Well, this is a yes or no question
 1
      at this point. The question was: "Did Charlie ask her
 2
      any questions. Without saying what the questions were or
 3
      were not, can you answer that question?
 4
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
                THE COURT: Okay. What is your answer to that
 6
 7
      question?
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
 8
            What did Charlie ask you?
 9
        Q
10
                MR. ZOOK: Hearsay.
                MS. BECKER: May we approach?
11
12
                THE COURT: Sustained.
13
                MS. BECKER: May we approach?
14
                THE COURT: You may.
15
                     (An off-the-record discussion was held
                     at the bench.)
16
17
                THE COURT: The objection will be sustained.
      BY MS. BECKER:
18
            Ms. Macioce, you indicated that you had a
19
2.0
            conversation with Charlie Lambert approximately
            four weeks later.
21
22
            Yes.
23
            During that conversation, did you encourage him to
24
            do something?
25
        Α
            Yes.
```

STATE'S WITNESS - FLORENCE MACIOCE - (CROSS)

- Q What did you encourage him to do?
- A I encouraged him to go down and talk to the police department about what he spoke to me about.
- Q Okay. I don't have any further questions. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Zook.

MR. ZOOK: No questions.

THE COURT: And Mr. Crawford.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. CRAWFORD:

1

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

- Q Ms. Macioce, you had indicated that you had seen

 Lana Canen outside the apartment complex on

 November 28, 2002. Isn't that correct?
- 14 A Correct.
 - Q And she was the only person you'd seen outside the apartment complex on that date in question. Isn't that correct?
- 18 A Correct.
- MS. BECKER: No further questions, your Honor.
- 20 THE COURT: Ms. Becker, any additional
- 21 question?
- MS. BECKER: No redirect?
- 23 THE COURT: Anyone else have any questions for
- 24 this witness?
- 25 MR. ZOOK: No, sir.

```
THE COURT: You may step down. Watch your
 1
      step, please. Is she released?
 2
 3
                MS. BECKER: Yes, your Honor.
                THE COURT: Mr. Zook, Mr. Crawford.
 4
                MR. ZOOK: Yes, sir.
                MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, your Honor.
 6
 7
                THE COURT: She'll be released on her subpoena.
      Call your next witness.
 8
                MS. BECKER: Thank you. State of Indiana would
 9
10
      call Detective Carl Conway.
                THE COURT: Raise your right hand, sir.
11
12
                     (The witness was sworn.)
1.3
                THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
14
                THE COURT: Take the witness stand, please.
15
                             CARL CONWAY
      called on behalf of the State, having been first duly
16
17
      sworn, testified as follows:
                         DIRECT EXAMINATION
18
19
      BY MS. BECKER:
2.0
          Good afternoon. Would you please introduce
            yourself to our jury?
21
            I'm Carlton Dean Conway.
22
23
            Mr. Conway, what do you do for a living?
24
        Α
            I am currently employed as a Detective with the
            Elkhart City Police Department.
25
```

- Q How long have you been at the Ekhart City Police
 Department?
- A I've been with Elkhart City since 1998. I was with South Bend Police Department since 1996 before that.
- Q Okay. Before you became a police officer, did you attend any special schooling?
- A Yes.

- Q Where did you go?
 - A Went to the Indiana State Law Enforcement Academy.
- 11 Q During the academy, did you learn different tactics
 12 as far as policing is concerned and interviewing
 13 tactics?
- 14 A Yes, ma'am.
 - Q Since that time, have you received additional training in the areas of interviewing -- well, why don't you tell us what your training is?
 - A Since back in the detective bureau, I have gone to two different interview schools. One for basic interviewing and interrogation also an advanced interview and interrogation school put on by the Reid Corporation. And I've also gone down to the Southern Police Institute which is a homicide school. It's put on down at the University of Louisville.

- Q A couple of years ago, were you a part of the homicide team that was formed at the Elkhart Police Department?
- A Yes, ma'am, I was.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q During that time, did you have the occasion to take over the investigation of the murder of Helen Sailor?
- A Yes, ma'am, I did.
 - Q What did you do when you first got this case?
- 10 A When I first got the case, I spent a long duration
 11 of time just reviewing documentation that already
 12 existed from the previous investigator.
 - Q Okay. Who were the previous investigators?
- 14 A D'Andre Christian was the primary that originally had the case.
 - Q Was Detective Todd Thayer involved in the original investigation as well?
 - A Yes. Detective Todd Thayer and D'Andre Christian they work in -- in conjunction with each other as part of a homicide investigation before the homicide unit was organized.
 - Now, when you got this case and started looking at it, at the time that you picked it up, was it considered a cold case, or was it considered just one that you needed to look at?

- A A cold case is when you go ahead and you've
 exhausted every avenue, every lead, and then we
 also have what we call unresolved cases where there
 still may be some work that could be looked into.
 At our opinion, it was more of an unresolved case.

 O Okay. And when you looked at this case, did you
 - Q Okay. And when you looked at this case, did you then go back through with a fine tooth comb and follow up on all of these leads?
- 9 A Yes, ma'am.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

- Q All right. Now, after following up on all of these leads, did there come a time when the attention shifted to two specific individuals?
- 13 A Yes, ma'am.
- 14 Q Who were those people?
- 15 A Lana Canen and Andrew Royer.
- Q Now, after -- let me ask you this. Did there come a time when you or a member of your team spoke to Nina Porter?
- 19 A Yes, ma'am.
- Q Did she provide you information that assisted in this investigation?
- 22 A Yes, ma'am, she did.
- Q After speaking to Nina and getting that information, who did you directly go to?
- 25 A Andrew Royer.

- Q When you came into contact with Andrew Royer, explain to us how that came about?
 - A After obtaining the information from Nina Porter, we collectively thought about it. We decided to go try to take -- try to interview Andy about the homicide; and we went to this apartment, introduced ourselves told him why we wanted to speak to him, invited him down to the police department. He willingly accompanied us.
- 10 Q Who is we?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

- A I'm not quite sure who was with me at the time. I believe it might have been Lieutenant Posthuma or Sergeant Bill Wargo. I'm not quite sure.
- Q And at that time, did the defendant, Andy Royer, come with you?
- 16 A Willingly, absolutely.
- 17 Q All right. Who drove him there?
- 18 A I did.
- 19 Q On the way there, did you talk about anything?
- A No. He was over at the Waterfall Highrise. It's only about a block and a half from the police department, relatively a quick drive.
- Q Okay. Once you got to the police department, what happened?
- 25 A We got to the police department. Went ahead and

escorted Andy into one of the interview rooms. At that time we, like I said, once again, we reiterated why we were talking to him, advised him of his Miranda Rights, told him that we were looking at him in reference to having possible involvement in Helen Sailor homicide. He waived his right to writing, and then we proceeded to have an interview.

2.0

- Q Okay. Let's back up just a little bit. Do you remember specifically what you told him as far as why you were talking to him?
- A I told him that we had obtained information saying that he was involved with the murder of Helen Sailor.
- Q When you told the defendant, Andrew Royer, that, how did he respond?
- A He had been -- originally, he was out of denial, but he was -- wasn't very confrontational about it.

 He seemed pretty relaxed about the whole situation.
- Q You also indicated that you read him his Miranda Warnings. What are the Miranda Warnings?
- A Anytime we start an interview with any potential suspect, we have a legal rights advise form which we'll go ahead and advise him of the Miranda Warnings kind of what you see on TV and -- and if

they agree to talk to us, we request a signature, 1 and then we go ahead and sign as a witness where 2 3 it's time and dated. Did you have a conversation with Andrew Royer about 4 Q 5 his Miranda Warnings? Yes, ma'am. 6 Α 7 Did he appear to understand you? Q Yes, ma'am, completely. Α 8 In fact, did you have different conversations with 9 Q 10 him. (The witness coughed.) 11 12 I'm sorry. Do you need some water? Q 13 Α No. I'm okay. Thank you. 14 Did you have conversations with him so that you could get a feel for what his level of 15 16 understanding was? Yes, ma'am. 17 Α Okay. Did you believe that he understood the 18 Q Miranda Warnings when you provided them to him? 19 20 Α 100 percent. And did he execute that sheet indicating he 21 0 understood and was waiving his right? 22 23 Yes, ma'am. He reviewed it. We reviewed it 24 together. He signed it in agreement to speak with 25 me.

Okay. Now, how did you conduct an interview with 1 Mr. Royer? 2 3 (A cell phone rang in the courtroom.) THE COURT: Anybody who has a cell phone, let's 4 get it turned off right now. Does everybody have their 5 cell phone or pager turned off? 6 7 BY MS. BECKER: How did you conduct an interview with Andrew Royer? 8 Well, obviously due to the nature of the topic, we 9 Α 10 originally start off what we call a preinterview at that time. But we'll sit there. We'll just have 11 12 casual conversation, just trying to build a base 13 rapport with the individual, and then gradually 14 ease our way into the topic at hand. Okay. Is this something that takes time to do? 15 0 16 It can take a long time to do. 17 0 What time, if you recall just general, did you bring Andrew Royer to the police department that 18 19 day? 20 Α It was -- if I can refer to the Miranda Rights Form, I believe the time would be on that. 21 I'm going show you what's been marked for 22 Q 23 identification purposes as State's Exhibit 15. Do 24 you recognize this? 25 Yes, ma'am. This is the Miranda Rights Form filled

out by me and Mr. Royer. 1 Okay. Does this accurately depict the -- the 2 Miranda Rights form that you personally executed 3 with the defendant, Andrew Royer? 4 Yes, ma'am. This is a carbon copy of it yes, 5 Α ma'am. 6 7 What date did that interview occur? 0 September 3, 2003. Α 8 All right. And what time did that occur? 9 Q 10 Α As written on here, it was 9:34 a.m. MS. BECKER: Okay. Thank you. State would 11 12 move to admit what's been marked for identification 13 purposes as State's Exhibit 15. 14 MR. ZOOK: No objection. 15 MR. CRAWFORD: No objection, your Honor. THE COURT: State's Exhibit No. 15 will be 16 17 admitted without objection. MS. BECKER: State declines publication at this 18 19 time. 2.0 BY MS. BECKER: So about 9:30 in the morning you go through rights 21 0 and then you do this preinterview process. 22 23 Yes, ma'am. Α 24 0 What -- why do you do a pre-interview? 25 Like I said, just to go ahead and build a rapport

- at first, and then obviously due the topic at hand there is denials. It's kind of almost like a -- I mean, it's -- it's an interview where we're trying to go ahead basically sift through, I guess, the nonsense that's going on. In fact, it can take quite a long amount of time.
 - Q Okay. Is this recorded either audiotaped or some other method?
- A At that time, no, it was not.
- 10 Q Why not?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

- 11 A Well, that was the procedure that our police
 12 department had established at the time.
 - Q Okay. And how long did it normally take to get through a pre-interview with an individual who is a suspect in a homicide?
 - A It -- it -- it -- there's no set time. This particular one was only a matter of a couple of hours, two or three hours.
- 19 Q All right. You started about 9:30. Did you 20 provide any breaks in there?
- 21 A Yes, ma'am.
- 22 Q What kind of breaks.
- A We brought Mr. Royer food. He was allowed to use
 the restroom. He basically -- we made him -- we
 made very well aware that he was -- basically any

need -- any need he had he was allowed to let us 1 know and we would try to accommodate him anyway we 2 3 could. He was allowed to have cigarette breaks. During this pre-interview, was there any 4 Q question that -- where he was understanding you? I mean, were you able to communicate with him? 6 7 Absolutely. Α Okay. During the preinterview, did there come a 0 8 time when the defendant, Andrew Royer, began to 9 10 make some admissions to you about Helen Sailor's murder? 11 12 Yes, ma'am. Α 13 Q Before we go any further, first of all, do you see 14 person that you were speaking to that you've referred to as Andrew Royer in the courtroom today? 15 16 Yes, ma'am. Α 17 0 Would you please describe what he is wearing and where he is seated in the courtroom? 18 Dark haired gentleman wearing a cream colored 19 Α 2.0 short-sleeve shirt, glasses sitting just beside Mr. Crawford. 21 MS. BECKER: Thank you. Would the record 22 23 please reflect this witness has identified the defendant, 24 Andrew Royer. THE COURT: The record will so reflect. 25

BY MS. BECKER:

- Q When you were talking to the defendant, were there any techniques that you have used that you found helpful in getting the defendant to open up to you?
- A Just basically it was what we refer to as a retechnique. It's one of the techniques we learned during interview school.
- O What is that?
- A Basically, we -- as we talk to the person, we openly confront them with the situation and the knowledge that we have in reference to their participation in the crime, and Mr. Royer was very susceptive to it, and he openly admitted that he committed the homicide.
- Q How much information do you actually give?
- A Oh, we would try -- we try not to give any at all.
- Q Okay. When -- help us understand what you're talking about here. For example, you confront them with something, but yet what do you hold back?
- A We basically hold the back primary details. When we confront them with very vague generalized information that we have whether we say, you know, we do have witness statements. There is evidence. We are very vague and generalized. And what it is and then when it comes time when they do confess to

- them that way it gives them the opportunity to give 1 us the details of the incident that we'll go ahead 2 3 and corroborate that they did actually commit the crime. 4 Okay. Why would you hold back details? I mean, 5 Q that's a way to get them to talk, isn't it? 6 7 Well, it's also a way you can also feed them Α information that they can go ahead and either 8 one -- it can -- they can go ahead and -- they can 9 10 go ahead and create their own defense on, or it can 11 also -- they can also use that as saying that we 12 forced them to say these things. 13 Q Okay. In your experience as a detective, do you 14give details in your interviews? Very limited; very limited. 15 Α 16 Okay. When you were interviewing the defendant, Q 17 Andrew Royer, for first time on September 3, did you give him any details about Helen Sailor's 18 murder? 19 20 No. As a matter of fact, in Mr. Royer's case I Α made a point not to do it. 21 Why not? 22 Q
- A I mean, I -- we were well aware of Mr. Royer,
- and -- and of -- we had limited knowledge about his
- 25 mental background. So I definitely wanted to make

- a point not to give to Mr. Royer just for the sheer fact that he might go ahead and dispose of the concept that we might have been spoon feeding him information.
- Q Okay. Now, during this preinterview when the defendant, Andrew Royer, started giving you details about the murder of Helen Sailor, what specifically did he tell you he did?
- A He gave renditions of it; but for the most part, he openly admitted that he went into Helen Sailor's apartment and he strangled her, and then he was able to give us details about how he committed the strangulation along with what he did to dispose of some of the evidence that was -- that we found during the original investigation that corroborated what he was saying.
- Q Okay. Did he demonstrate anything for you?
- 18 A Yes, ma'am, he did.

- Q What specifically did the defendant, Andrew Royer, demonstrate for you?
 - A During the interview when he was talking about how he strangled Ms. Sailor, I -- I took my tie off, and I -- and I -- and I asked him, please, show me how you did it. And without hesitation he reached forward and acted like he grabbed the collar of my

shirt, and he twisted his hand like this. He said 1 I grabbed her, and I twisted, and I held her like 2 3 this. Okay. Did he continue to provide details that 4 Q were corroborated by other physical evidence? Yes, ma'am. 6 Α 7 Anything specific? Q He talked about the fact that there was a rope that Α 8 was used. That was a piece of information that no 9 10 one was aware of. We did find marks on Ms. Sailor's neck that indicated she was strangled 11 12 by a rope. He talked about areas of her apartment 13 that was cleaned up, along with items that were 14 used from her apartment that no one knew about. MR. CRAWFORD: Objection, your Honor. 15 Speculation as to what no one knew about who may or may 16 17 not have known it. MS. BECKER: I'll rephrase it. 18 THE COURT: Let's, you know, let's stick to 19 20 question and answer and probably we won't have that happen. The objection will be sustained. Rephrase. 21 BY MS. BECKER: 22 23 Did the defendant refer to items of -- or cleaning 24 up things that were details not released to the 25 public?

- 1 A Yes, ma'am.
- Q Were there other details that were not released to
 the public which the defendant seemed to have
 intimate knowledge of?
- 5 A Yes, ma'am.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q What were those?
 - A Locations within the apartment that were rummaged through, where some of the evidence was disposed at.
 - Q Where was that?
 - A Waterfall Highrise has an internal garbage chute that goes to every floor where you can drop items down, and they will go down into a main hopper down -- actually adjoined to the building outside the parking lot. Some of the items -- some of the towels that were used to clean up the area of the scene were actually thrown in the garbage chute, and we found them in the hopper. He knew this. No one else -- we did not ever disseminate that information to him.
 - Q Okay. So there were some details that you kept completely private.
- 23 A Yes, ma'am.
- 24 Q Yet he had intimate knowledge.
- 25 A Absolutely.

- Q Now, by this time, did you figure out you probably ought to get this on tape?
- 3 A Yes, ma'am.

9

- Q All right. What did you do at that point?
- A After we -- after we finalized the pre-interview
 then I openly told Mr. Royer, pulled out a tape
 right in front of us, and we went ahead and
 conducted a audiotape confession.
 - Q Did the defendant Andrew Royer's demeanor change when he saw that tape recorder?
- 11 A Very much.
- Q Did you still get -- try to take a statement from him?
- 14 A Yes, ma'am.
- 15 Q I'm going to show you what's been marked for

 16 identification purposes as State's Exhibit 16. Do

 17 you recognize this?
- 18 A Yes, ma'am.
- 19 Q What is it?
- 20 A It is a dubbed copy of the confession statement 21 taken from Mr. Royer on September 3, 2003.
- Q Have you had an opportunity to listen to what's been identified at State's Exhibit 16?
- 24 A Yes, ma'am.
- 25 Q Is this an accurate recording of the interview that

```
you did with Andrew Royer on September 3, 2003?
 1
            For the most part, yes, ma'am.
 2
            Are there areas that have been blanked out for
 3
        0
            evidentiary purposes?
 4
            Yes, ma'am, there has been.
            All right. Other than that, is it accurate in it's
 6
        0
 7
            entirety?
           Yes, ma'am.
        A
 8
 9
        Q
            Thank you.
10
                MS. BECKER: State would move to admit what's
      been marked for identification purposes as State's
11
12
      Exhibit 16.
13
                MR. CRAWFORD: No objection.
                MR. ZOOK: No objection, your Honor.
14
15
                THE COURT: Without objection, Exhibit 16 will
      be admitted, and I have a question.
16
                     (An off-the-record discussion was held
17
                     at the bench.)
18
                THE COURT: Proceed. 16 is admitted without
19
20
      objection.
21
                MS. BECKER: State would move to publish
      State's Exhibit 16 by playing it for the jury.
22
23
                THE COURT: Any objections?
24
                MR. CRAWFORD: No objection, your Honor.
                MR. ZOOK: No sir.
25
```

```
THE COURT: Without objection, State's Exhibit
 1
      16 will be published to the jury at this time. Ladies
 2
 3
      and gentlemen, we're going to play this tape for you. If
      you cannot hear it, get your hand up, let us know, and
 4
      we'll make adjustments.
                     (State's Exhibit 16 was published to
 6
 7
                     the jury.)
                MR. ZOOK: Your Honor, there's a point
 8
      objection that I want to make to the next statement that
 9
10
      the jury will hear on this.
                THE COURT: The next statement.
11
12
                MR. ZOOK: Yes. Once it finally comes back on
13
      again.
14
                THE COURT: Well, the exhibit has been
15
      introduced.
16
                MR. ZOOK: I guess I was misunderstood what was
      taken out of it.
17
18
                MS. BECKER: Excuse me. May we approach.
19
                     (An off-the-record discussion was held
2.0
                     at the bench.)
                THE COURT: The objection will be overruled.
21
22
                MS. BECKER: Thank you.
23
                     (State's Exhibit 16 continued to be
24
                     published to the jury.)
25
                MS. BECKER: May we approach.
```

THE COURT: You may.

2.0

(An off-the-record discussion was held at the bench.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to give you a recess. We have a legal issue we're going to address.

You are all jurors in this case. I must tell you now and I will repeat this again each time you are permitted to separate.

Generally, you should not express any opinion about the case before it is submitted to you for deliberation; however, you are permitted to discuss the evidence presented in this case amongst yourselves in the jury room during recesses from trial. All jurors and alternates must be present during these discussions, and you must reserve judgment about the outcome of the case until your deliberations begin.

You are admonished that you may not discuss the facts of the case with anyone other than your fellow jurors.

You may not discuss this case with me or with the lawyers, parties or with any of the witnesses.

You should not listen to or read any outside or media accounts of the trial. You may not investigate the case or attempt to obtain information outside the

courtroom. It is highly improper for you to do so. You are to consider and decide this case only upon the evidence received during the course of the trial in the courtroom. You'll be in care of the bailiff.

2.0

2.5

(The jury left the courtroom, and the following proceedings were had.)

THE COURT: All right. The record should reflect the jury has left the courtroom. Ms. Becker, you have called the Court's attention to a portion of the tape, Exhibit 16, which has a reference to Lana Canen. Is it your proposal that we edit the tape at this time with the jury outside of the courtroom?

MS. BECKER: Well, your Honor, for the record the state does not belief this is a Bruton Rule in any way, shape, or form. However, to avoid any further problem, the state is willing to redact at the Court's direction.

THE COURT: Mr. Zook, you've raised an objection, and you want this part redacted to avoid any Bruton Rule problem.

MR. ZOOK: Right. That's correct, Judge, and I want the say thank you for the prosecutor. I think both of us thought there was no references in the tape.

THE COURT: Okay. And, Mr. Crawford, you have nothing to say about this because it doesn't involve your

```
situation. Right?
 1
 2
                MR. CRAWFORD: Right.
 3
                THE COURT: Let's error on the side of caution.
      Let's take it out. Would you read the words you're going
 4
      to edit out of the record, Ms. Becker?
 5
                MS. BECKER: Mr. Zook, what do you want edited
 6
 7
      out?
                THE COURT: Just so when the Court of Appeals
 8
      or anyone else picks up this record they'll know what was
 9
10
      edited out of Exhibit 16.
                MR. ZOOK: I would like to see, "okay, did you
11
12
      ever speak -- yes. Did you ever speak to Lana about
13
      this. Answer, no, I never talked to her about it.
14
                THE COURT: You want those words removed?
                MR. ZOOK: Right.
15
16
                MS. BECKER: State would agree to do that.
                THE COURT: All right. Can you do that?
17
18
                MS. BECKER: Yep.
                THE COURT: All right. Let's take a break
19
20
      while you're doing that. When we come back, we'll pick
      up it up right after the edited portion. Take a short
21
      break.
22
23
                     (A short recess was taken.)
24
                     (The Court convened with all the
25
                     parties present. The jury entered the
```

```
courtroom and the following
 1
 2
                     proceedings were had.)
                THE COURT: Be seated, please. Ms. Becker.
 3
                MS. BECKER: Thank you, your Honor.
 4
                      (State's Exhibit 16 continued to be
 5
                     published to the jury.)
 6
 7
      BY MS. BECKER:
            Detective Conway, why did you end the interview at
 8
            that point?
 9
10
        Α
            It -- it was very obvious that you could tell that
            Mr. Royer was starting to get very fatigued and
11
12
            just go ahead and for the preservation of his right
13
            (unintelligible) the case we decided to go ahead
14
            and conclude the interview at that point so he
            could go ahead and get some rest.
15
16
            Did you then allow Mr. Royer to leave?
        Q
17
        Α
            No. At that point, Mr. Royer was placed under
            arrest for murder.
18
            Then did you allow him to go somewhere so that he
19
        Q
2.0
            could sleep?
            Yes, ma'am. He was -- he was escorted back to the
21
        Α
            detention area where he was, I mean, given food,
22
23
            allowed to sleep.
24
        0
            Okay. Do you know if he did sleep?
25
            I couldn't testify to that. I assume he did.
```

```
501
 1
      STATE OF INDIANA )
                                IN THE ELKHART CIRCUIT COURT
 2
                          ) SS:
                                CAUSE NO: 20C01-0309-MR-00155
      COUNTY OF ELKHART
                          )
 3
      STATE OF INDIANA,
 4
           v.
 6
      ANDREW M. ROYER,
 7
           Defendant.
 8
                             VOLUME III
10
                Reporter's transcript of the proceedings in the
11
12
      above-entitled matter commenced on Monday, August 8,
13
      2005; Tuesday, August 9, 2005; and Wednesday, August 10,
      2005, before the HONORABLE TERRY C. SHEWMAKER, Judge of
14
15
      the Elkhart Circuit Court, Goshen, Indiana.
16
17
18
19
2.0
21
      APPEARANCES:
22
      FOR THE STATE OF INDIANA: Vicki Elaine Becker and Denise
23
      A. Robinson
24
      FOR THE DEFENDANT CANEN: R. Brent Zook
2.5
      FOR THE DEFENDANT ROYER: Christopher C. Crawford
```

- Q The next day did you again try to continue your interview?
- A Yes, ma'am, I did.
- Q Did Mr. Royer appear to be refreshed?
- 5 A Yes, he did.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

- Q Tell us about how he appeared as far as his state of mind at that point in time?
- A You could tell he was -- you could tell he was obviously concerned. He had made comments how he was afraid of talking to me because he was afraid that he was gonna' -- cause he knew that he would get in trouble because from what he had done.

We went ahead and talked and kind of rebuild that rapport again. At one point in time I even made a point to tell him that, you know, he would -- he would probably feel better if he would just be straight with me and come out with everything.

- Q At this point in time, did you believe he was telling you everything that he knew?
- A No.
- Q Was that based upon what you already knew about the scene?
- 24 A Correct.
- Q Okay. Even though you know they're not telling you

the truth, or what you believe to be the truth, do 1 you still do what you did by taking that audio 2 3 recording so that you could produce that later? Yes, ma'am. 4 Α 5 All right. So the next day, namely, September 4, did you try to go at him again to try to get the 6 7 truth out? Yes, ma'am, I did. Α 8 9 Q I'm going to show you what's -- oh, I'm sorry. 10 Before you began the next interview, did you Mirandise him once again? 11 12 Yes, ma'am, we did. He was -- submit another form Α 13 where he went ahead and signed and waived his 14rights again. I'm going he show you what's been marked for 15 16 identification purposes as State's Exhibit 17. Do 17 you recognize this? Yes, ma'am. This is a carbon copy of the Miranda 18 Α Form dated September 4, 2003, and the time he was 19 20 advised was 8:25 a.m. Okay. Is this a true and accurate representation 21 Q 22 of the actual Miranda form that -- or a carbon copy 23 of the Miranda form that you provided to the 24 defendant, Andy Royer, and had him sign? 25 Α Yes, ma'am.

0 Once again, you did you communicate with him his 1 rights, and did he waive those rights? 2 3 Α Yes, he did. Did he appear to understand you? 4 100 percent. MS. BECKER: State would move to admit what's 6 7 been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 17. 8 MR. ZOOK: No objection. 9 10 MR. CRAWFORD: No objection, your Honor. THE COURT: State's Exhibit No. 17 will be 11 12 admitted without objection. 13 MS. BECKER: State declines publication at this 14 time. BY MS. BECKER: 15 Detective Conway, I'm now showing you what's been 16 marked for identification purposes as State's 17 Exhibit 18. Do you recognize this? 18 Yes, ma'am. 19 Α 20 Q What is it? This is a dubbed copy of the second confession 21 Α given by Mr. Royer on September 4, 2003. 22 23 Okay. Does this -- or have you had an opportunity 24 to review this audiotape?

2.5

Yes, ma'am, I have.

```
Is it an accurate copy of the audiotaped interview
 1
            that you did with Andrew Royer on September 4?
 2
 3
        Α
            Yes, ma'am, it is.
                MS. BECKER: Thank you. State would now move
 4
      to admit what's been marked for identification purposes
 5
      as State's Exhibit 18.
 6
 7
                THE COURT: Mr. Zook.
                MR. ZOOK: No objection.
 8
                THE COURT: Mr. Crawford.
 9
10
                MR. CRAWFORD: No objection.
                THE COURT: Exhibit 18 will be admitted without
11
12
      objection.
13
                MS. BECKER: State moves to publish State's
14
      Exhibit 18 by playing the same to the jury.
15
                THE COURT: Mr. Zook.
                MR. ZOOK: No objection.
16
                THE COURT: And Mr. Crawford.
17
                MR. CRAWFORD: No objection, your Honor.
18
19
                THE COURT: State's Exhibit 18 will be
      published without objection.
20
21
                     (State's Exhibit 18 was published to
                     the jury.)
22
23
                MS. BECKER: No further questions at this time.
24
                THE COURT: Mr. Zook, cross-examination.
25
                MR. ZOOK: Yes, sir.
```

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. ZOOK:

2.0

- Q Detective Conway, you made these two recordings of Andrew, and yet there's nothing leading up to the recordings. I believe you said it's department procedure that you not record anything until the time of the actual statement.
- A At the time we have what we call a pre-interview, yes, sir.
- Q And it was your procedure that you would not record the pre-interview.
- A That's correct.
 - Q Was that true for other people you talked to as well, no recording the pre-interview?
 - At that time, that was the homicide unit's procedure. At the time that we had the Royer case -- that we started the Helen Sailor case, the homicide unit was kind of in it's -- in it's infantile stages, and we were trying to go ahead and set parameters on how we would go and conduct interviews, and how we would go ahead, and the procedures and policies that we would go ahead and have, and at the time this is the way that they went ahead and decided to go ahead and do it.
 - Q The -- the -- the tape recorder was there

obviously. Right? 1 That is correct. 2 Α 3 Q And you had access to tapes. Is that right? That is correct. 4 Α But because of department procedure, you 5 Q deliberately did not record the pre-interview? 6 7 That is correct. Α MR. ZOOK: All right. No more questions. 8 THE COURT: Mr. Crawford. 9 10 MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you, your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION 11 12 BY MR. CRAWFORD: 13 Detective Conway, I believe the first time you 14 mentioned that you had spoken with Andrew Royer was on September 3rd of 2003. Is that correct? 15 16 No, that was not correct. Α 17 When was the first time you spoke with Mr. Royer? Actually, the first time I spoke with Mr. Royer was 18 Α through the initial investigation during the Helen 19 2.0 Sailor case where I was assisting Detective Christian in a building canvas. 21 And when was that exactly? 22 23 I can't remember the exact date, sir. Α 24 0 Was that early on in the investigation process? That was within the days following the homicide. 25

Would you have made an assessment concerning your 1 feelings of the mental abilities of Andrew Royer at 2 3 the time you initially had come into contact with him? 4 At the time I initially came into contact with 5 Mr. Royer, I was assisting Detective Christian. I 6 7 had just came back to the homicide unit. Correction. Back to the detective bureau, and I 8 9 was assisting Detective Christian. She was the one 10 who spoke to Mr. Royer. So were you with Detective Christian when she spoke 11 0 12 to Mr. Royer? 13 Α Oh, yes, sir, I was. 14Q Were you able to observe his demeanor during the course of those interviews? 15 16 We spoke for a few minutes, yes, sir. Α 17 0 So were you able to get an impression of his mental abilities at the time you first spoke with him when 18 you were with Detective Christian? 19 20 I knew that there were some mental issues, yes, Α sir. 21 How much involvement did you have with the case 22 23 initially on in its early stages after Ms. Sailor's 24 body was found?

Not much. Just with the initial 24/48 hours worth

of the investigation.

- Q Do you recall how many people you assisted with in speaking with or how many you spoke with directly at the time of your involvement in that first couple of days?
- A No, sir. Like I said, I was pretty much just attached to other detectives assisting them.
- Q No idea how many you had talked to?
- A No, sir.
 - Q Did you gather a lot of information during those first couple of days in your involvement with the initial investigation?
 - A Like I said, I was assisting other detectives. I was pretty much kind of, I guess what you say, a gopher. I was kind of just a person who would be there to assist the other detectives while they went ahead and handled the investigation.
 - Q But did you learn things while you were being a gopher?
- A Yes, sir.
 - Q Okay. And was it only the first initial couple days that you were involved in this before you were later involvement again? When specifically did you get reinvolved with the investigation?
- THE COURT: I think we got a two-part question.

1 One at a time. MR. CRAWFORD: I'm sorry. I'll rephrase that. 2 3 Thank you, your Honor. BY MR. CRAWFORD: 4 When did you stop being actively involved initially 5 in the investigation? 6 7 Like I said, it was probably within the first 24/48 Α hours. I was just extra manpower to assist other 8 detectives. 9 10 Q And it was in -- during that course of time when 11 you spoke with Detective Christian and Andrew 12 Royer. 13 Α Yes. 14 Q When exactly did you get back involved in the investigation again? 15 16 After I was assigned to the homicide unit, the case Α 17 was assigned to me for investigation. Do you recall specifically when that was? 18 0 No, I don't. I know it was within a couple weeks 19 Α 20 of us speaking to Royer. At the time that you got back involved in this 21 Q investigation again, did you thoroughly review the 22 23 file including case reports and supplements? 24 Α Yes, I did.

And did you look at all of the same statements that

were given by these at the time that you reviewed 1 the file? 2 3 Α Yes, I did. Outside of looking at the file, did you talk with 4 Q other representatives of the police department and 5 gather additional information that may not have 6 been included in the file? 7 I did ask if there was anything I needed to know, Α 8 9 yes, sir. 10 0 Who specifically was involved in the homicide unit at the time of your initial involvement in this 11 12 case? 13 Α At the time it was being lead by Lieutenant Paul 14 Converse, second in command was Sergeant Bill Wargo, and then there was Detective Mark Daggy, 15 16 Lieutenant Posthuma, and myself. 17 0 Now, you mentioned when you -- so the second time that you would have come involved -- come in 18 contact with Mr. Royer was when you picked him up 19 20 to bring him in the Elkhart Police Department. Is that correct? 21 22 That's correct. 23 And that was on September 2 of 2003. Is that 24 correct?

2.5

Α

That is correct.

- And I believe that you mentioned at that time that 1 you were accompanied by -- who exactly do you 2 remember being accompanied by you went to pick up 3 Andrew Royer? 4 If I do recall I said I really -- I couldn't 5 Α 6 recall. 7 Any reason to believe it might not have been 0 Detective Mark Daggy? 8 Like I said, I couldn't recall. I knew it was 9 Α 10 somebody from the unit. I couldn't tell you for certain whom. 11 12 Do you recall when you went to pick up Andrew Royer Q 13 and questioned him whether he took his medication 14 with him to the Elkhart Police Department? No, sir, he did not. 15 Α He did not not take it. 16 No, sir. 17 Α Do you recall if he -- if you had asked him if he 18 0 had taken his medication before going to the 19 2.0 Elkhart Police Department? No, sir. I do not recall if I did or not. 21 Α Now, I believe you testified that it was 22
 - approximately at 9:34 a.m. or somewhere around there when you gave him his Miranda Warning. Is

25 that correct?

23

- Α That is correct.
- Q And it was after that that you conducted a interview with him. Is that correct?
- That is correct. Α

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- And it wasn't until approximately 1:30 or 1:00 o'clock in the afternoon that the tape recorder began to role. Is that correct?
- That is correct. Α
- And you mentioned when Mr. Zook was up here that it Q was not a departmental policy to record the audio statements of the accused or alleged accused at the time of the events when you first spoke with him?
- Α The pre-interview, sir.
- 14Q Right. And did you have access to videotape cameras at that time? 15
 - Yes, sir, we did. Α
 - And is that something that you could have used either at the pre-interview time or at the time the person was making the statement?
 - Once again, that was not policy at that time. Α
 - And you've indicated I believe during direct 0 examination that you did not take any specific notes at the time during the pre-interview phase. Is that correct?
- 24
- 25 No, I didn't state that, sir.

- Q Did you take specific notes at the time of the pre-interview stage?
 - A I took notes throughout the duration of our interview, yes, sir.
 - Q You mentioned, I believe, during direct examination that you were careful in this particular interview because you potentially had some issues or knew the status of Mr. Royer concerning some mental deficiency problems. Is that correct?
 - A I didn't say I knew the status. I said I knew that there was obviously something there.
- 12 Q Potential concerns.
- 13 A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

20

21

22

- Q Did you seek to obtain any information concerning
 that particular issue before questioning Mr. Royer?
- 16 A Yes, we did.
- Q Did you seek to have a case manager or someone
 available with him when you questioned him from
 Oaklawn?
 - A No, sir, we did not.
 - Q But again, you testified that you were somewhat aware of his mental status at the time you questioned him. Correct?
- 24 A Yes, sir.
- 25 Q To your knowledge, while he was being housed in the

Elkhart Police Department September 3rd through 1 September 4th prior to your second interview with 2 him did, Mr. Royer have his medication? 3 Yes, sir, he did. 4 Α When specifically do you recall him taking that? 5 Q After Mr. Royer was arrested for the murder of 6 7 Helen Sailor, we went back -- he gave us permission to go back to his apartment and obtain his medicine 8 so he could have it. 9 10 0 So to your knowledge this would be after the tape recorded statement. Is that correct? 11 12 The first one yes, sir. Α 13 Q Okay. I believe you mentioned during the course of 14direct examination that there appeared at time or times that Mr. Royer appeared mentally fatigued. 15 16 Yes, sir. Α 17 Do you feel that he would appear tired concentration abilities? 18 Yes, sir. 19 Α 20 Problems associated with that. Q I'm sorry. I don't understand, sir. 21 Α Problems associated with his concentration at one 22 23 point in time. Is that correct? 24 Α Yes, sir, as well as myself. 25 Q You're not being treated at Oaklawn, are you?

- No, sir. 1 Α 2 Now, I believe you also mentioned that there was 3 some indication that a particular pawnshop might have been in place for certain items that could 4 5 have been sold after the 28th. Is that correct? Yes, sir. 6 Α 7 And I believe you mentioned that Mr. Royer, or at Q least the tape recording indicated that Mr. Royer 8 may be able to show that to you. Is that correct? 9 10 Α Yes, sir. 11 Q Did that take place after the fact? 12 Mr. Royer pointed out the pawnshop to us, yes, sir. Α 13 Q Is it fair to say that you were unable to recover 14anything when you went into that pawnshop? That is correct, sir. 15 Α And there was no indication from any representative 16 Q 17 from that pawnshop that they had dealt with Mr. Royer on the 29th or thereafter. Is that correct? 18 19
 - That is correct, sir. Α

21

- And you had them go through the books. Is that Q correct?
- Α That is correct, sir.
- 23 Did you investigate any other leads of persons who 24 might have taken these items and taken them to the 25 pawnshop?

Yes, sir. Α

1

5

6

7

8

9

18

20

21

- Were you able to find anything in that 2 3 investigation?
- No, sir. 4 Α

MR. CRAWFORD: Just a second, your Honor, if I may have a few moments?

- Officer, were there other police officers involved in the actual securing of the -- of Ms. Sailor's apartment?
- 10 Α Yes, sir.
- And were you one of those officers? 11 Q
- 12 Α I was present, sir. But, now, as far as the 13 original officers who secured that would have been, 14 I assume, articulated by Detective Christian.
- So in that regard, there were other officers that 15 16 would have a better insight as to what was 17 discovered or recovered at Ms. Sailor's apartment. Is that correct?
- That is correct. 19 Α
 - You don't have first-hand knowledge as to that Q specific event.
- No, sir. 22 Α
- 23 And prior to talking to Mr. Royer, had you talked 24 to other individuals again before speaking with him in August of -- or September of 2003? 25

A Yes, sir.

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

21

22

- Q Had you talked to a number of individuals before speaking with Mr. Royer?
- 4 A No, sir.
 - Q Were you part of the party that went back to highrise and canvassed the area and spoke to people at the highrise before your spoke to Mr. Royer?
 - A I'm sorry. I don't really understand the question, sir.
 - Q Prior to speaking with Mr. Royer on September 3rd of 2003, had you spoken with other individuals at the highrise?
 - A Spoken of other individuals, yes, but not specifically about Mr. Royer.
 - Q Right. I understand that. About the actual series of events from November 28th of 2002.
- 17 A Yes.
- Q And had you done that when you joined the homicide force in August of 2003, I believe?
- 20 A Yes.
 - Q You recall how many individuals you spoke to at the highrise concerning this incident in August of 2003 before speaking with Mr. Royer?
- A It'd be documented in the case. I couldn't tell
 you -- I couldn't tell you for certainty off the

top of my head. 1 And through these individuals you gathered 2 3 information. Is that correct? Yes, sir. 4 Α And you had all of this information before you 5 spoke to Andrew Royer on September 3, 2003. 6 7 All of what information, sir? Α The information that you gathered from reviewing 0 8 the file, from speaking with other witnesses? 9 10 Α Yes, sir. MR. CRAWFORD: No further questions, your 11 12 Honor. 13 THE COURT: Ms. Becker. 14 MS. BECKER: Just briefly. 15 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 16 BY MS. BECKER: Detective Conway, you indicated that because you 17 were aware of Mr. Royer's challenges mentally that 18 you did speak to some people at Oaklawn. Correct? 19 20 Α Yes, ma'am. After inquiring into his condition further, did you 21 0 find it was necessary at all to have a 22 23 representative or someone there on his behalf? 24 Α No. As a mater of fact, we were told that, that 25 wasn't necessary.

- Q Okay. And when you were talking to Mr. Royer, did he give you any indication whatsoever he didn't understand you?
- A No, ma'am. He was -- he was very -- he seemed to be very articulate. I mean, there was obviously you could tell he was -- I would say slow. But I mean, by no means whatsoever did I think that he did not fully understand everything that was going on.
- Q In fact, you had at least three different versions of what had happened by that time. Correct?
- A Yes, ma'am. He did give several renditions of what happened.
- Q All right. And During the preinterview or actually right after the preinterview did he make some comment to you about why his stories were changing?
- A Yes, ma'am, he did.
- 18 Q What did he say?

- A He openly told me -- I was trying to get him -- I was trying to get him at ease and basically we knew it was there that he had it inside of him. He just had a hard time stating it, and he even told me he said he goes, "I know if I tell you what I did I'm going to get in a lot of trouble."
- Q Okay. So based upon that fact he told you he was

going to get into trouble, you'd already talked to
Oaklawn and followed up on his mental capacity, and
clearly he was giving you different renditions
maybe fabricating something. Did it appear to you
that there was any problem of his mental processes
other than being slow?

- A No. It was very apparent to me that he knew he had done something wrong and knew the ramifications of it.
- Q Okay. Now, when you went to go check the pawnshop, did you check to find out whether any false names had been used on registers or books?
- A Yes, ma'am. We checked the registers and the computers.
- Q Okay. And Andy Royer's name never came up.

 Correct?
- A No, ma'am.

2.0

- Q Did you ask him whether he used any false names, or did you find out whether maybe he had somebody help him in this situation?
- A As far as false names, no. He -- he indicated that he was the one who took them -- or took -- that he was the one who sold these items. He even went as far as to actually accompany us to the pawnshop, point it out, and actually physically walked in the

```
pawnshop with us and this is where I sold the
 1
 2
            items.
 3
        Q
            Okay. But the person there at that time really
            couldn't help you confirm or contradict that?
 4
            That is correct.
 5
        Α
            Okay. And finally, you indicated during direct
 6
 7
            that it wasn't until after you had furthered this
            investigation, spoke to Nina Porter, that it
 8
            focussed on Andy Royer. So at the time that you
 9
10
            were reviewing all of these prior statements and
            going back to the highrise and conferring with all
11
12
            of these people, did you know absolutely that Andy
13
            Royer was a suspect at that time?
14
        Α
            No, ma'am.
            So it wasn't until later that you were able to put
15
        0
            all this into context. Is that true?
16
17
        Α
            That is correct.
            Thank you. I don't have anything further
18
        Q
            questions.
19
2.0
                THE COURT: Mr. Zook.
                MR. ZOOK: No questions.
21
                THE COURT: Mr. Crawford, recross.
22
23
                MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you, your Honor.
      ////
24
      1111
25
```

STATE'S WITNESS - CARL CONWAY - (RECROSS)

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. CRAWFORD:

1

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- Q Detective Conway, do you remember specifically what day it was that you went to Oaklawn to speak to the representative about Andrew Royer?
- A Actually I spoke to a gentlemen on the phone. I can't recall the gentleman's name. It would be in the case book. He was the one who told me about Andy's condition.
- Q Do you know -- do you recall his name?
- A Like I said, it would be in the case book.
- Q And you don't recall the day. It's in the case book. Is that correct?
 - A No, sir, I do not.
 - MR. CRAWFORD: Nothing further, your Honor.
- 16 THE COURT: Any other questions from any

17 counsel?

- 18 MR. ZOOK: No sir.
- MS. BECKER: No, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: You may step down, sir. Watch your
- 21 step. Is he released from his subpoena. Yes, yes.
- 22 Ladies and gentlemen we're going to recess for
- 23 the day. During the recess, I need to tell you. You are
- 24 all jurors in this case. I must tell you now and I will
- 25 repeat this again each time you are permitted to

separate.

Generally, you should not express any opinion about the case before it is submitted to you for deliberation; however, you are permitted to discuss the evidence presented in this case amongst yourselves in the jury room during recesses from trial. All jurors and alternates must be present during these discussions, and you must reserve judgment about the outcome of the case until your deliberations begin.

You are admonished that you may not discuss the facts of the case with anyone other than your fellow jurors.

You may not discuss this case with me or with the lawyers, parties or with any of the witnesses.

You should not listen to or read any outside or media accounts of the trial. You may not investigate the case or attempt to obtain information outside the courtroom. It is highly improper for you to do so. You are to consider and decide this case only upon the evidence received during the course of the trial in the courtroom. Have a good evening. See you at 8:15.

(No further proceedings were had in this matter on this date.)

2.5

WEDNESDAY, JULY 11, 2005

(The Court convened with all the

parties present, and the following

proceedings were had.)

1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: The record reflects the defendant, Mr. Royer, is present with his counsel, Mr. Crawford. The defendant, Ms. Canen, is present with her counsel, Mr. Zook. Counsel for the state is also present. I'm unsure if the record is clear on what occurred earlier. I think we ought to clear it up at this time. There was, I believe it was witness Matt Johnson, a question asked by Mr. Crawford as to whether or not Mr. Johnson had any violent tendencies. State objected. Court called counsel to the bench, and the Court made inquiry of Mr. Crawford as to whether or not he had any evidence to indicate Matt Johnson was involved in this. Mr. Crawford indicated he did not have any such information, but he wanted his question answered because it was a part of his defense.

Court sustained the objection and indicated to Mr. Crawford that the Court would permit Mr. Crawford to call Mr. Johnson when the defense was presented on behalf of Mr. Royer, that would be Mr. Crawford's client. The Court made arrangements before Mr. Johnson left the courtroom for him to be held on his subpoena and informed

```
him of such. He indicated to the Court he would remain
 1
 2
      available, and he understood what the Court had stated.
 3
                Court also notes that the question was outside
      the scope of the direct exam of Ms. Becker with respect
 4
 5
      to witness Johnson. Is that an accurate representation
      of what occurred, Ms. Becker?
 6
 7
                MS. BECKER: Yes, your Honor.
                THE COURT: And, Mr. Zook?
 8
 9
                MR. ZOOK: I believe so, yes.
10
                THE COURT: And Mr. Crawford.
                MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, your Honor.
11
12
                THE COURT: Are we ready to qo?
13
                MS. BECKER: Yes.
14
                     (The jury entered the courtroom, and
                     the following proceedings were had.)
15
16
                THE COURT: Be seated, please. Good morning
17
      ladies and gentlemen. Ms. Becker, call your next
      witness.
18
19
                MS. BECKER: State would call Erika Roarhig.
                THE COURT: Raise your right hand.
2.0
                     (The witness was sworn.)
21
                THE WITNESS: I do.
22
23
                THE COURT: Take the witness stand, please.
     1111
24
      1111
25
```

1		ERIKA ROARHIG
2	calle	d on behalf of the State, having been first duly
3	sworn	, testified as follows:
4		DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY MS. BECKER:	
6	Q	Good morning, ma'am. Would you please introduce
7		yourself to our jury?
8	А	Hi, I'm Erika Roarhig.
9	Q	Erika, what do you for a living?
10	A	I'm a registered nurse.
11	Q	What do you work now?
12	A	Currently I work at Mason's Health Care in Warsaw.
13	Q	What kind of a business is Mason Health Care.
14	A	It's a nursing home and it's also a restorative
15		nursing. We do rehab for patience that had
16		surgery.
17	Q	How long have you been with Mason's Health Care?
18	A	I've only been with Mason for three months?
19	Q	Prior to that, did you work for Regional Home
20		Health Care in Elkhart?
21	A	Yes, I did. I was their director of professional
22		services.
23	Q	What exactly is the director of professional
24		services?
25	A	I was responsible for nursing scheduling, doing

- nursing visits, the home health aids.
- Q Okay. Back in November of 2002, were you working with for Regional Health Care?
 - A Yes. At that time I had left and came back, and I

 was their acting director at that time.
 - Q How long you been with Regional by about November of 2002?
- 8 A About two years.

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

- Q Now, I'd like to draw your attention to Thanksgiving Day of 2002, actually the day before that. Did you have a client by the name of Helen Sailor?
- 13 A Yes, I did.
 - Q How long has Helen Sailor been your client?
 - A I believe Helen Sailor had been with Regional since they had opened. So she had been a client of theirs for several years.
 - Q How long had you personally been assisting Helen?
- 19 A I had been assisting Helen for about two years.
 - Q What did you do exactly do for Helen by around November of the 2002?
 - A At that time, she required skilled nursing. We went up, and we set up her medications for a her, and we did her blood pressure and her pulse, and listened to her lungs. Just made sure that

- physically she was doing fine at home.
- Q Was it your responsibility to set out her medications?
- A Yes. We set out her medications every two every two weeks, because she was blind she couldn't see to do them herself so we set them up for her?
- Q How would you set up her medication?
- A She had two pill boxes. We saw her once every two weeks. So we put all of her pills in there for morning, noon, evening and suppertime; and we stacked the two pill boxes on top of each other, and we put all her other pills up in the cupboards so that she wouldn't get them, she wouldn't touch them.
- Q In your experience, had Helen ever touched the other medications, the back up medications?
- 17 A No.

- Q In the two years that you helped Helen, do you recall what kind of a container the remainder of the back up pill bottles were kept in?
- A We had one -- we had one bag that we kept some in that were extra ones that we hadn't used yet. And the ones that we were currently using we kept in a the clear plastic container like a little square about like this.

- Q Okay. Is that the same container she had all along?
 - A Yes. As long as I had been taking care of her.
 - Q And that was for approximately two years?
- A Right.

- Q Now, when did you last fill Helen's medication prior to Thanksgiving day of 2002?
- A The day before, the 27th.
- Q The 27th. Would that have been Wednesday?
- 10 A Yes.
- 11 Q Do you remember what time you got there in the morning?
 - A I don't remember. I'm thinking it was more towards the end of the day actually because I think I went and saw her right before I went and picked up my son.
 - Q When you saw her and took care of her meds, explain for us exactly what you did that day, if you can recall?
 - A I went in, I talked to Helen, and I went and got
 her -- her medicines out of the cupboard and her
 pill boxes, and then she had a little single bed
 that was over against the one wall, she had a chair
 here, and I also went and sat on that little single
 bed and sat her pills out and her folder that

- listed all her meds, and then I would start filling
 them all.
 - Q Okay. How long did it normally take for you to fill all of her medications for a two-week period.
 - A It takes a good half hour.
 - Q Were you talking to Helen during this time?
 - A Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q As you would fill the medications, did anybody ever come over and visit with Helen or stop by and say hello, that kind of thing?
- A Yeah. She'd have other people that lived in the apartment that would stop by and say Hi, and sometimes we had these supervisory visits and sometimes our home health aides would be there working with Helen supervising, make sure that they were doing their job correctly.
- Q Now, you indicated that this medical container or this rubber -- I'm sorry -- this plastic container that you kept the reserve pills in, where did you say you kept that?
- A It's kept up in the cupboard.
- Q Okay. And then where were the daily pills the plastic daily pills?
- A Those were kept on the counter right up in the corner.

- Q Okay. I'm going to show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 22. Do you recognize this, Erika?
- A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

- Q What is it?
 - A This is Helen's little kitchenette here.
- Q Does this show the plastic container that you were referring to that keeps the reserve medication?
 - A Yeah. They're sitting here on the stove.
 - Q Does it also show the daily medicine boxes that you were discussing?
- 12 A Right. Right here on the counter.
- Q Now, as they appear in this photograph, is that normally how they were?
 - A No. No. This container would be up there in the cupboard. These pills would be up there above that. None of these would be out. These would all be in here.
 - Q Let me -- because we're aren't showing the photograph let me talk about -- don't show the photograph. The plastic container that's on the stove now, where would that be?
- 23 A That would be up in the cupboard.
- Q Okay. The pill dividers that are set out weekly,
 where would those be?

- Α Those would be all the way up in the corner next to the stove on the counter.
- Q The white plastic -- or the white paper bag where would that be?
- That would also be up in the cupboard. Α
 - And the pill bottles that are lose sitting on the Q counter, where would those be?
 - Those would be either in the white paper bag or Α they'd be in the plastic container. They were never left out.
 - Okay. Thank you. In your experience in the time, the two years that you helped Helen set out her medication, did you ever find the medication boxes out on the sofa like that?
- Α No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- When you left on the 27th, where did you put the Q medication boxes?
- Up in the cupboard. Α
- Now, you indicated that you were an individual that 19 Q 20 sets out her pills. Were you the only person that was responsible for setting out her pills? 21
- No. Any of the other nurses I might have assigned 22 Α 23 to do that.
- 24 Okay. Do you specifically recall it was you that did it the day before she died?

A Yes.

- Q Any idea when it was prior to that time when were you there as opposed to somebody else?
 - A I honestly don't recall.
 - Q Okay. Based upon your experience and granted we all know, you know, there's lots of people that go through a process of filling a prescription. Is there any way that you could tell with absolute certainty how many pills were supposed to be there?
 - A No. Not unless I had been there from day one.
- Q Why not.
 - A Because, I mean, once in a while we all forget to take a pill so it might have been left over.

 Unless the nurse documented that, oh, she forgot to take this pill and so it was put back. You know, I mean, unless I got the pills from the pharmacy, the pharmacy could have miscounted. I mean, somebody could have, dropped one and thrown it away, you know, when they were filling it. I mean, there's occasion where I might have dropped one; and if I dropped it on the floor, I'm not going to give it Helen. I would take it to the sink and throw it
 - Q So is it possible to tell how many pills should have been present?

away and get a new one so --

There's no way to really tell. 1 Α Did there come a time during the time that you 2 treated Helen or that you assisted Helen where she 3 would discuss religious topics with you? 4 Yes. Helen was a very religious lady. I mean, we 5 Α usually God bless each other when we left. But 6 7 other than that, typically I don't discuss religion with my patients. 8 I don't have any further questions. Thank you, 9 Q 10 Mrs. Roarhig. THE COURT: Mr. Zook. 11 12 MR. ZOOK: Thank you. 13 CROSS-EXAMINATION 14 BY MR. ZOOK: Hi, Erika? 15 16 Α Hi. You're in charge of all these people that take care 17 of the pills and the nursing and the whole bit. 18 How long have you been doing this? 19 20 I've been a registered nurse for 20 years. Α Okay. Have you been doing the home health care for 21 0 20 years? 22 23 No. I was at Memorial rehab for ten years. I did 24 nurse case management. I did -- I've done pretty 25 much a lot of different realms. I've been doing

- 1 that for two years.
- Q You expect to be doing this for the rest of your nursing career?
 - A Nursing, yeah.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- Q Certainly there's a retirement home for nurses.
- A Pretty much.
 - Q Okay. I'm interested in the pills that you set out. I understand that it's difficult to keep track of the number of pills in the bottles and so forth but -- but you put the pills into the daily and weekly containers the night right before Thursday, right, right before Thanksqiving?
- 13 A Yes.
- Q So as far as the pills that were in the containers,
 you surely could figure out if any of those were
 missing, couldn't you?
- 17 A That were in the daily containers?
- 18 Q Right.
- 19 A Yes.
- Q It's just the ones that you don't know about that are up in the reserve box.
- 22 A Right.
- Q Okay. And you could probably get an estimate on
 those, couldn't you, from -- from knowing when the
 prescription dates were and --

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

14

15

16

21

24

25

Α

No.

Α Not really because Helen was on Medicaid so a lot of times you had to make sure that you always had enough pills, like, when I left I would have to make sure that there was still enough pills left in her bottles for when the next nurse came to fill it for another two weeks. If there was only going to be enough pills for 13 days, then you would have to reorder. And you always wanted to reorder before the end of month because her spin down was met. 10 And otherwise she'd have to meet her spin down again at the beginning of the next month before she could get their pills. 13 Q Okay. So you did this two weeks at a time. And if -- if one pill would be used once a day, there should be 14 of those in the -- in the boxes that were for daily use. 17 Α There should be one for each day. One for each day minus whatever she used? 18 0 19 THE COURT: Excuse me. You need to answer yes. 2.0 THE WITNESS: Sorry. Okay. THE COURT: What you would answer be? THE WITNESS: Yes. 22 Okay. Now, you by any chance take medication out 23

of boxes like that yourself?

[8/8/2005] 20050809CanenRoyer

- Q Okay. After you have filled the boxes, the daily,
 weekly pill boxes, have you ever gone back and
 rechecked what you did?
 - A Yes.

5

8

- Q Have you ever found mistakes when you did that?
- A Typically, no. But occasionally you're going to find mistakes. We all make mistakes.
 - Q Especially when there are people interrupting what's going on?
- 10 A Yes.
- 11 Q And you said there'd been a pill container that

 12 you'd seen for a couple of years that was the -
 13 the Tupperware or Rubbermaid type clear bin that

 14 extra pills were in. Right?
- 15 A Right.
- 16 Q Now, how many times had you personally been the one 17 to fill the pill -- the daily/weekly bins.
- 18 A I would say probably 20 times for Helen.
- 19 Q Okay. Over that two-year period.
- 20 A Correct.
- Q Are you absolutely positive it was the same pill bin that she had?
- 23 A Yes.
- 24 Q How can you be so sure?
- 25 A It's the same one because we would be the ones that

would purchase her a new one, and we never 1 2 purchased her the new one. I mean, it was always 3 the same clear plastic container. It never changed. I mean, except it got more wore with 4 time. 5 What brand name is it that you would purchase her 6 7 if you were to purchase a pill bin? I wouldn't do it. My CNA would go do it for her. Α 8 I mean, it would be something at Venture or 9 10 Wal-Mart something of that, but I wouldn't personally go do that. 11 12 I noticed that there was in -- in one of the 13 pictures, which I assume you saw but I don't know 14 exactly what you saw, there's full pill bin and there were some additional bottles sitting beside 15 it. Was that normally the way things were kept? 16 17 Α No. The pill bin was not quite big enough to store all 18 of her medication. Is that right? 19 20 А That's correct. So wouldn't you want to purchase her a bigger bin 21 0 in that case? 22

23

24

```
or that had been discontinued or on hold were kept
 1
 2
            in the paper bag.
 3
        Q
            Okay. Would you describe the bin that she had?
            It's a clear plastic bin about eight by four by
 4
        Α
            six.
            What was on the bin?
 6
 7
            There was nothing on the bin. I mean, it was
        Α
            clear. It might have had a manufacture label; but
 8
            other than that, I don't recall it having anything
 9
10
            on it.
11
            Do you recall any name on the bin?
        Q
12
        Α
            No name.
13
        Q
            No name.
14
        Α
            I don't recall.
            No more questions.
15
        0
                THE COURT: Mr. Crawford, any questions?
16
                MR. CRAWFORD: No questions, your Honor.
17
                THE COURT: Ms. Becker, any redirect?
18
                MS. BECKER: No further.
19
20
                THE COURT: You may step down. Watch your
      step, please. Is she released on her subpoena?
21
                MS. BECKER: Please, your Honor.
22
23
                MR. ZOOK: Yes, your Honor.
24
                MR. CRAWFORD: Yes.
25
                THE COURT: Thank you. Call your next witness.
```

1	MS. BECKER: Detective Joel Bourdon.
2	THE COURT: Raise your right hand.
3	(The witness was sworn.)
4	THE WITNESS: I do.
5	THE COURT: Take the witness stand, please.
6	JOEL BOURDON
7	called on behalf of the State, having been first duly
8	sworn, testified as follows:
9	DIRECT EXAMINATION
10	BY MS. BECKER:
11	Q Good morning, sir. Would you please introduce
12	yourself to our jury?
13	A My name is name Joel Bourdon.
14	Q Mr. Bourdon, what do you do for a living?
15	A I'm a police detective technician.
16	Q How long have you been with the police department.
17	A Since April of 1987, 18 a little over 18 years.
18	Q When you first joined the police department were
19	you required to go through any training or gather
20	any schooling in order to become a police officer?
21	A Yes.
22	Q What kind of training did you receive?
23	A I attended the Indiana Law Enforcement Academy the
24	basic training session.
25	Q Okay. When you first joined the police agency,

what was your capacity?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- A I was a uniform patrol officer.
 - Q How long were you a uniform patrol officer?
 - A About a year and a half.
 - Q What did you do next for the police department?
 - A I went to the detective bureau.
 - Q While you were in the detective bureau did you receive further training and schooling regarding interview techniques, evidence techniques, things like that?
- 11 A Yes, I did.
 - Q Can you explain to the jury what kind of schoolings you went to and different certifications you have obtained?
 - A Initially, actually, I believe I was still in uniform division when I first started attending

 Northwestern University Traffic Institute for accident reconstruction. It was taken down at Plainfield, Indiana is actually where I took my initial courses; and then also through the course of the years then I've attended classes on arson investigation to -- over in Ohio that's both the basic and advanced and then subsequently I received training in a lot of different topics.
 - Q Okay. You received training in processing crime

scenes?

- A Yes. Most of that was done after 1992 which is when I started doing what I do now, a detective technician.
- Q Why don't you tell us exactly what a detective technician is first?
- A Basically, my -- my duties consist of responding -upon being requested, responding out to crime
 scenes. Most of them are of serious nature, death
 investigations of different types. And when I get
 there, my job is to document, photograph, videotape
 collect evidence, take measurements, diagram and
 then subsequently then we may process evidence
 further. We may send it to laboratories, a variety
 of things, and then eventually prepare it and bring
 it to court if needed.
- Q Since 1992 when you started as a Detective technician until present day, any idea how many hours of advanced schooling you've obtained?
- A A lot.
- Q Okay. What types of courses?
- A I -- I initially started by taking a course from the Federal Bureau of Investigation on physical evidence, preservation, and collection. That was, I believe, a one -- week course. And then since

then I've taken classes through Northwestern

Traffic Institute up in Evanston, Illinois on crime scene work. I believe I took a photography class from them. I also took a facial reconstruction course, and then I attended several seminars through Wayne State University up in Michigan, death investigation type courses.

And then most recently this last fall I attended ten week -- the National Forensic Academy down in Knoxville, Tennessee. I attended that.

- Q In fact, the academy that you just attended, did you rank in your graduating class?
- A Yes, ma'am.

- Q What was your rank in your graduating class?
- A I receive -- I -- I don't know that we would call it a ranking, I -- they issue one award. It's call the Doctor Bass Award for achievements in forensic investigations, and I received that out of my class of 16 people.
 - Q Okay. So since 1992 or approximately 13 years that you have been doing this detective technician position, any idea how many death scenes you have teched?
 - A I think I could safely say over 100, probably hundreds. It's very difficult to say. A lot of

- them -- it may vary on our involvement. It may be something where my services are not needed, and one of the other technicians would complete those tasks.
- Q As part of all of the schools that you have been to, have you been trained regarding fingerprint detection and lifting or preserving?
- A Yes.

2.0

- Q What about serum or bodily fluid for purposes of DNA testing?
- 11 A Yes, I have.
 - Q Are there very detailed procedures that must be followed in order to preserve evidence like this?
 - A Yes.
 - Q In your experience in the crime scenes that you have -- or in the scenes that you teched, do you find that it's easy to gather forensic evidence such as DNA or fingerprints or bodily fluids?
 - A Is it easy. There are occasions where it's a relatively simple process after you've done it for a while, and there's been lots of changes over the years on how all of this is done and advancements in technology. It becomes more difficult with time actually because of the sensitivity of testing.
 - Q Let me ask you this, Detective Bourdon. Is it easy

to find -- actually, I shouldn't say it that way.

What characteristics are necessary before you can

detect something like a fingerprint?

- A Well, in that case, much of it is just making it become visible. Most -- most latent impressions, most fingerprint impressions left behind are difficult to see with the naked eye unless you process them further. Once they're located, the actually recovery process is relatively simple.
- Q Have you been trained on the different ways to locate fingerprints?
- A On a large variety of them. I'm sure not all of them.
- Q Okay. And could you just briefly explain a couple of the ones that are ones that you typically use?
- A Well, probably the most common way of -- of locating fingerprint impressions is dusting. It's nothing more than using a -- there's several different types of brushes that you use. They're very fine, and you apply a powder. There's a multitude of powders out there that can be used, and basically it's applying that dust to the impression left behind it. It makes it become visible.
- Q Now, we'll talk about fingerprints a little bit

more in a few minutes, but let's go ahead and move 1 onto November 29 of 2002. Did you receive a 2 3 request to arrive at the Waterfall Highrise approximately November 29, 2002? 4 5 Yes, I did. Α Any idea what time of day it was? 6 7 I believe I got there shortly after eight o'clock Α in the morning. 8 Okay. When you arrived on that scene, first of 9 Q 10 all, do you remember what you did when you first 11 qot there? 12 When I first got at the scene, I met with the Α 13 supervisor at the time which was Lieutenant Tom 14 Lerner. He's -- actually, I believe he's the one requested that I respond to that location. And 15 16 then from there, he provided me with the initial 17 information they he had at that point. Do you get briefed by officers on the scene as much 18 as possible so that you can start narrowing down a 19 2.0 crime scene? Yes, yes. 21 Α Based upon the information you had received thus 22 23 far, what did you believe to be the actual crime 24 scene regarding Helen Sailor's death?

25

Α

Helen Sailor's apartment.

- Q Did you then go to Helen Sailor's apartment?
- A Yes.

- Q When you begin an investigation and specifically in Helen Sailor's investigation after the briefing and after figuring out where the crime scene is, what is the first course of action that you take?
- A I normally at that point in time physically look at it myself.
- Q Why do you just take a look at it to begin with?
- A Just to see in my eyes what I see that appears to be relevant to what the crime we're investigating, in this case, her death. What items might -- could possibly be related. You don't always know because you've got -- it's like anybody else's home, there's lot of stuff, and so you have to kind of get a feel for what might be related to it because it is -- so much of it is unknown at that point in time.
- Q Now, prior to your arriving, is the scene or the area that might be involved secured in any way?
- A Yes.
- Q And the normal course of practice ever since you've been a police officer, how is a scene secured?
 - A Normally what takes place, every scene is different, but normally what takes place is that

there will be an officer posted, a uniform officer normally, to secure the location and that can be done in a variety of ways. In this particular case, it was an officer standing at the doorway to the apartment. This was on the tenth floor so access was extremely limited of course naturally.

- Q When you arrived at the Helen Sailor's apartment, was a uniform officer standing at the door guarding the scene?
- A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q And when you went into the apartment, did you have to basically log in or identify the fact that you are now present?
- A Yes. They logged -- that's that officer's job also to maintain a log of who enters and exits the scene.
- Q Okay. So from the time that the scene is secured by the police department whatever time that may be until the time that you arrive, do you believe the scene is usually secure?
- A Yes.
- Q Obviously you have no way of knowing what occurred before police got involved. Correct?
- 24 A That's correct.
- Q Okay. But once police get involved, do you feel

- comfortable with the security of scene?
- A Yes. Our officers are good at it.

2.0

- Q Now, on November 29 in the morning hours after you got a good look at Helen Sailor's apartment, what was the next function?
- A After I reviewed that, it was determined that

 Officer McConnell, he was the uniform technician,

 would assist me in the processing of the scene and
 then I began videotaping.
- Q Why do you videotape a scene first?
- A Just to get a -- it's -- it's difficult to show everything. Part of my job is to be able to show this to everyone else whether it be investigators, prosecutors, anybody including the jury later on, what as best we can portray it, and one of the good ways in doing that is videotaping. We normally do that first just to show the -- what we see as best we can in the human eye.
- Q I'm going to show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 19.
 Will you take a look at this and tell me if you recognize it?
- 23 A Yes, I recognize the label on this.
 - Q What is it?
- 25 A This is the copy of the scene videotape related to

this case. 1 2 All right. And this case means the Helen Sailor 3 homicide? Yes. 4 Α All right. Does this videotape accurately depict what personally observed in Helen Sailor's 6 apartment the morning of November 29, 2002? 7 Yes, it does. Α 8 Thank you. Do you believe that this videotape will 9 Q 10 enlighten the jury and illustrate your testimony as not only the layout but also the way that the scene 11 12 appeared on the morning you discovered it? 13 Α Yes, it would. 14 MS. BECKER: Thank you. State moves to admit what's been marked for identification purposes as State's 15 Exhibit State's 19. 16 17 MR. ZOOK: No objection. MR. CRAWFORD: No objection, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Without objection, State's Exhibit 19 20 19 will be admitted. 21 MS. BECKER: State would move to publish State's Exhibit 19 by showing it to the jury. 22 23 MR. ZOOK: No objection. 24 MR. CRAWFORD: No objection, your Honor. THE COURT: And without objection, State's 25

```
1
      Exhibit 19 will be published electronically.
                      (State's Exhibit 19 was published to
 2
 3
                     the jury.)
            What are we looking at in this view?
 4
        Q
            This is the hallway of the tenth floor of the
 5
        Α
            Waterfall Highrise.
 6
            Are you the person actually behind the video camera
 7
        Q
            in this?
 8
            Yes, I am.
 9
        Α
10
        0
            Why did you take this scene?
            This is just showing the overall view of what we
11
12
            see out in the hallway, just showing the
13
            surrounding area, what kind of environment it was.
14
        Q
            What apartment number was Helen Sailor's apartment?
            1002.
15
        Α
16
            Is this the door to Helen Sailor's apartment?
        Q
17
        Α
            Yes, ma'am, it is.
            Why are you focussing on the locking mechanism?
18
        Q
            It was just part of the normal course of
19
        Α
2.0
            investigation. You -- you would review what access
            ways there are. And in this case it would be that
21
            door whether there's damage to the doorway or not.
22
23
            Now, you're entering into Helen's apartment. What
24
            area are you seeing now?
            You're facing towards the north -- actually, right
2.5
```

- 553 now you're seeing the floor area in the entry 1 2 hallway. 3 Q Why do you do that? Try to show everything that you can: up, down, show 4 Α 5 all the views, show what we see. Just like you would if you walked into her room. 6 7 To your knowledge, had anyone disturbed anything Q prior to your getting there? 8 I believe from the information I received was that 9 Α 10 family members had looked in the victim's person 11 purse. 12 Do you wear gloves or any other kind of protective Q 13 material while you are even doing this process? 14Α Yes. Why? 15 Q 16 Α Just to protect everything so if I inadvertently tripped or had to catch myself that I wouldn't 17 transfer anything. I normally wear gloves and 18 footwear protection. 19 20 This key ring that you're focussing on right now, Q were there any keys on that key ring? 21 No, ma'am. 22 Α
- Q Did anybody advise you that they had removed those keys prior to your arriving?
- 25 A No.

- Q The thing that you focussing on right there, the little white bottle that was off on the table, was that exactly where you found it?
- A Yes, ma'am, it was.
- Q Did you find any ropes or strings or anything like that in that vicinity?
- 7 A No.

2

3

4

5

6

8

- Q In fact, did you find anything like that anywhere in the apartment?
- 10 A No.
- 11 Q This small bed right here and the Bible that is on
 12 it, do you have any information that anyone had
 13 manipulated or touched that Bible prior to your
 14 arriving, or do you know?
- 15 A Not that I'm aware of.
- 16 Q What is this little package?
- 17 A It was a Ziplock style bag, and it appeared to have antacids in it.
- 19 Q What are we looking at here?
- A This was believed to be the victim's purse. The black edge of it is shown in the video right now.
- Q Where are you standing when you're taking this shot?
- A Right now I'm at the doorway leading from that

 first room that we saw into the -- what I described

- - A Because it was damaged. The lock mechanism appeared to be pried.
 - Q Why do you make a point to document the position -the exact position of a body in a crime scene so
 early on?
 - A Just because you -- it might assist in determining the events.
 - Q Does the body get moved usually early on?
- 11 A No

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

- Q There's a bit of glimmery substance that we just saw on the left hand of Helen? Did you make note of this and collect samples of it during your processing the scene?
 - A If I recall correctly, that was not collected -the items -- what was on her hand was not collected
 at the scene. That would have been done later on.
 - Q Was there other areas in this apartment or right around Helen's body that also had that same glimmering substance?
- 22 A Yes.
- Q Did you collect samples of that?
- 24 A It was on some of the items that were recovered.
- 25 Q There's also kind of pinky substance that was

- around the body, a liquid. Did you collect samples of that?
 - A Again, that was also on some of the items which we collected so, yes, they were collected.
 - Q And did you later find bottles of things that might be consistent with those things in the apartment?
 - A Could be.

2.0

- Q Do you videotape those as well?
- A I believe so.
- Q What are we seeing here?
 - A Right now I'm showing the closet door. This is on the east wall of the -- kind of the small hallway leading from the bathroom into that east bedroom, and now it's showing a stain that was on the door itself behind the handle.
 - Q What are you focussing on now?
 - A Just showing the overall condition of the bed and the surrounding. There were stains observed on the wall showing the drawers and items that were kind of strewn about on the bed.
 - Q Did you also find some of this -- or what appeared to be consistent with the liquid on the floor in the drawers?
 - A Yes. That red colored -- reddish pink colored substance.

(The video was turned off.) 1 BY MS. BECKER: 2 Now, detective, after you finished taking the 3 video, what did you do next? 4 Normally, in this process we started taking 5 Α 35-millimeter photographs. 6 7 Why do you also take photographs? Q Just as another way of documenting what we Α 8 observed. 9 10 Q May I approach? THE COURT: You may. 11 12 Q I'd like to show you what's been marked for 13 identification purposes as State Exhibit 20. Do you recognize this? 14 Yes, I do. 15 Α What is it? 16 Q This is a photograph, and in the central area of 17 Α the photograph it's depicting a door knob and door 18 lock this being to the apartment door that we're 19 20 speaking of 1002. All right. Next I'd like to show you what's been 21 Q marked for identification purpose as State's 22 23 Exhibit 21. Do you recognize this? 24 Α Yes, I do. What is it? 25 0

- A This is a photograph taken standing at the front doorway to the apartment facing towards the north.
 - Q Thank you. Next I'd like to show you what's been marked for identification purpose as State's

 Exhibit 22. Do you recognize this?
 - A Yes, I do.
- Q What is it?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

18

19

- A This is a photograph taken showing the sink and stove area of this same apartment.
- Q Okay. Next I'd like to show you what's been marked for identification purpose as State's Exhibit 23.
- 13 A Yes, I do.
- 14 Q What is it?
- 15 A This is photograph showing the kitchen table and
 16 basically the west wall and adjoining furniture
 17 items in the same apartment.

Do you recognize this?

- Q Thank you. Next I'm showing you what's been marked for identification purpose as State's Exhibit 24.
- 20 Do you recognize this?
- 21 A Yes, I do.
- 22 Q What is it?
- A This is a photograph showing the kitchen table area and it's content.
- Q Okay. Is this photograph a little bit closer up

- than the one prior to it? The one prior to it
 would be State Exhibit 23.
 - A Yes, it is. It's more directed towards the specifically the table.
 - Q Okay. Thank you. Next I'm showing you what's been marked for identification purposes as State Exhibit 25. Do you recognize this?
 - A Yes, I do.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

- Q What is it?
- A This is a photograph showing the bed in the west room or the living room area of this apartment showing the items that were laying on the bed.
- Q Okay. Would that specifically be the Bible?
- 14 A The Bible and the associated envelope and a small paper there.
 - Q Next I'm showing you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 26. Do you recognize this?
- 19 A Yes, I do.
- Q What is it?
 - A This is photograph taken showing -- basically facing towards the east showing a recliner with a -- with a seat cushion inside of a bag and then a purse is laying on the floor next to that, and off to your left is a television.

[8/8/2005] 20050809CanenRoyer

0 Thank you. We're all these photograph; namely, 1 what's been identified as state's Exhibit 20 2 3 through and including State's Exhibit 26, taken the morning of November 29, 2002 or thereabouts? 4 Or thereabouts. It could have been the later on Α 5 that same day also. 6 Are these true and accurate representations of what 7 0 you personally observed in the apartment of Helen 8 Sailor as you were teaseling it on or about 9 10 November 29, 2002? 11 А Yes. 12 Do you believe they will assist the jury in 13 understanding the crime scene and being able to 14 illustrate your testimony? Most certainly. 15 Α 16 MS. BECKER: Thank you. State would move to 17 admit what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 21 through 26 inclusively. 18 THE COURT: Mr. Zook. 19 2.0 MR. ZOOK: No objection. THE COURT: Mr. Crawford. 21 MR. CRAWFORD: Your Honor, I would only object 22 23 to No. 21 in that it appears to be a similar shot to what 24 was already shot in the video and would be cumulative. 25 As for the other ones, I see that they're close pictures

```
and maybe not picked up in the video, but 21 I would
 1
      object to. Seems to be a similar shot to what was in the
 2
 3
      video.
                THE COURT: Well, all of these are similar to
 4
 5
      what appeared in the video.
                MR. CRAWFORD: They're closer than that
 6
      particular overall view.
 7
                THE COURT: Exhibits 19 -- excuse me --
 8
      Exhibits 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26 will be admitted
 9
10
      without objection by either counsel. Exhibit 21 will be
      admitted over the objection of counsel for the defendant
11
12
      Royer.
13
                MS. BECKER: State moves for publication of
      State's Exhibits 20 to 26 inclusive.
14
15
                THE COURT: Mr. Zook, any problems that?
16
                MR. ZOOK: No objection.
17
                MR. CRAWFORD: Still noting my objection, your
      Honor. I have no objection to the others.
18
19
                THE COURT: Exhibits 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26
20
      will be published without objection. Exhibit 21 will be
21
      published over the objection of the defendant Royer.
      They'll be published in the manner of the choosing by the
22
23
      state.
24
                MS. BECKER: Thank you, your Honor. State's
      Exhibit 20, 21 22, 23, 24, 25, 26.
2.5
```

```
(State's Exhibits 20, 21, 22, 23, 24,
 1
 2
                     25, and 26 were published to the
 3
                     jury.)
      BY MS. BECKER:
 4
 5
        Q
            May I approach?
                THE COURT: You may.
 6
 7
            Detective, next I'd like to show you what's been
        Q
            marked for identification purposes as State's
 8
            Exhibit 27. Do you recognize this?
 9
10
        Α
            Yes, I do.
            What is it?
11
        0
12
            This is a photograph of the victim, Helen Sailor,
        Α
13
            laying on the floor in the east bedroom area.
14
        Q
            Now, when you arrived on scene, had anybody come in
            and moved the clothing or moved the body to your
15
16
            knowledge yet?
17
        Α
            No.
            All right. So this is a depiction of what you
18
        Q
            actually observed when you first arrived?
19
20
        А
            That is correct.
            Thank you. Next I'd like to show you what's been
21
        0
            marked for identification purposes as State's
22
23
            Exhibit 28. Do you recognize this?
24
        Α
            Yes, I do.
            What is it?
25
        0
```

- A This is a photograph of the victim's left hand and the surrounding area.
 - Q Thank you. Next I'd like to show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's

 Exhibit 29. Do you recognize this?
- A Yes, I do.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

15

- 7 Q What is it?
 - A This is a photograph of the victim's right hand and surrounding area.
 - Q Next I'd like to show you what's been marked for identification as purposes as State's Exhibit 30.

 Do you recognize this?
- 13 A Yes, I do.
- 14 Q What is it?
 - A This is a photograph of a set of dentures and the surrounding area.
- 17 Q Thank you. I'm showing you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 31. Do you recognize this?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Q What is it?
- 22 A This is a photograph showing the front of the
 23 clothes dresser or bureau on the east wall of the
 24 east bedroom. It's showing that there were two
 25 drawers out of it.

- 1 Q Did you find those two drawers somewhere in the 2 apartment?
- 3 A Yes.

7

- 4 Q Where were they?
- 5 A Laying on the bed in that same room.
 - Q Now, I'm showing you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 32. Do you recognize this?
- 9 A Yes, I do.
- 10 O What is it?
- 11 A This is a photograph of one of the dresser drawers
 12 laying on the bed in that same room?
- Q Okay. Next is what's been identified as State's

 Exhibit 33. Do you recognize this?
- 15 A Yes, I do.
- 16 Q What is it?
- 17 A This is a photograph of the red jewelry box that
 18 was underneath the southeast corner of the bed in
 19 that room in the east bedroom.
- Q Thank you. Next I'm showing you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 34.

 Do you recognize this?
- 23 A Yes, I do.
- 24 O What is it?
- 25 A This is a photograph of partially the interior of

the closet located on the east wall of the east 1 hallway leading from the bedroom into the bathroom. 2 3 Q Thank you. And then finally, I'll show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's 4 Exhibit 35. Do you recognize this? 5 Yes, I do. 6 Α 7 What is it? Q This is a photograph of the kitchen sink or Α 8 actually the south end of the kitchen sink and part 9 10 of the refrigerator and countertop in the kitchen at this apartment. 11 12 Why did you take this photograph? 13 Α Just showing the overall condition of things, 14 showing the surrounding items that were both in the sink, around the sink. 15 16 Okay. The bottles that are in the sink, what did Q 17 you observe them to be? They're juice bottles. 18 Α What kind of juice? 19 Q 20 Α Ocean Spray. What kind of Ocean Spray juice? 21 Q I believe it was cranberry. 22 Α 23 Was it red cranberry or white cranberry, do you 24 remember?

It was a reddish color.

- And all of these photographs we've just discussed; 1 namely, what's identified as State's Exhibit 27 2 3 through State's Exhibits 35 inclusive, are these accurate representations of what you personally 4 observed on the morning -- I'm sorry. During the 5 day of November 29, 2002 at Helen Sailor's 6 7 apartment? Yes. Α 8 Do you believe that they accurately depict what you 9 Q 10 saw and would assist the jury in understanding your testimony? 11 12 Α Yes. 13 Q Thank you. 14 MS. BECKER: State moves to admit what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibits 27 15 16 through 35 inclusive. 17 THE COURT: Mr. Zook, any objection. MR. ZOOK: No, sir. 18 THE COURT: And, Mr. Crawford, any objection? 19
- MR. CRAWFORD: No, your Honor.
- 22 inclusive of 35 will be admitted without objection.

23

24

2.5

MS. BECKER: State moves for publication of State's Exhibit 27 through 35 inclusive through electronic publication.

THE COURT: State's Exhibits 27, through and

```
THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Zook.
 1
                MR. ZOOK: No, your Honor.
 2
 3
                THE COURT: Mr. Crawford.
                MR. CRAWFORD: No, your Honor.
 4
                THE COURT: State's Exhibit 27 through 35 will
 5
      be published in any manner of choosing by the state.
 6
 7
                MS. BECKER: 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32.
                     (State's Exhibits 27, 28, 29, 30, 31,
 8
 9
                     and 32 were published to the jury.)
10
      BY MS. BECKER:
            Now, Detective Bourdon, the box that is located in
11
12
            32 you characterized it as a jewelry box. Why did
13
            you do that?
14
            Because later in collecting that and that's what I
            found as its content.
15
16
            Did you actually identify the contents and keep
            that as evidence?
17
            Yes. That box and contents were recovered.
18
                     (State's Exhibits 33, 34, and 35 were
19
2.0
                     published to the jury.)
            Detective, after you had the opportunity to
21
        Q
            document all of the items in the apartment either
22
23
            by video and/or with 35-millimeter film, what did
24
            you do next?
25
            Then we begin the process of taking measurements to
```

locate furniture items, the victim' position. I 1 did this with the assistance of Officer McConnell. 2 3 Q Why do you do that? Just another way of documenting. Just another way 4 Α of as accurately as we possibly can documenting 5 locations. 6 7 In the event that it becomes important in a case later, can you then make a diagram; for example, if 8 9 the measurements or distances become important? 10 Α Yes. 11 Q After you've done the measurements and done this 12 rough sketch or whatever comes next, then what do 13 you do? 14Then you would begin in the process of collection and recovery of items. 15 16 Okay. Did you collect items such as the Bible, the Q 17 jewelry box, ect. Yes, later that day. 18 Α Okay. Now, why do you actually collect those kinds 19 Q 20 of items? With -- with many of them in this particular 21 Α circumstance was for the possibility of impressions 22 23 left by someone. 24 0 What do you mean by impressions?

Fingerprint impressions, palm prints.

25

Α

- Q Okay. For example, the medicine container, why did you collect that?
- A Because it was -- its positioning was such that is was out on the counter with lots of other items and it just -- medications just by their nature -- it just seemed an odd positioning. I don't -- that's the best answer I can give to that.
- Q Fine. Why did you collect the bottles from the sink?
- A Because of their positioning. They were out -- the red substance or pinkish red substance that was left in the bottle kind of coincided with what we saw in the second room, in the east room. I don't know that for sure, but that's why they were collected initially.
- Q Okay. And after you collected all of these items, did you what we call bag them and tag them?
- A Yes. They were -- they were bagged and then returned to the evidence area at the Elkhart Police Department.
- Q Okay. Once you have bagged them and at your first opportunity, do you seal them?
- 23 A Yes.

- 24 Q Why?
- 25 A The bags are sealed after we're done processing.

That can take an extended period of time. Until that time, they're secured; and then once they're sealed, it would be important for -- when they're transported somewhere else if they went to a laboratory to protect them.

- Q Okay. Do you also ensure that -- well, by the seal, do you ensure that there's been no tampering with the item?
- A Yes.

2.0

- Q Do you have to use different types of articles in order to bag them or package them depending upon the substance that you're -- or the items that you're collecting?
- A Yes, certainly.
 - Q Why do you have to worry about that?
 - A If you're submitting -- if it's an item that could be submitted later on for further examination for serology exam sent to a laboratory for testing, certain items, serology items need to be in paper unless there's -- and there's qualifiers to that even. Some can be in plastic depending on what they are, how they were obtained. It's just to be able to protect them so they don't degrade, the samples wouldn't deteriorate, for those issues.
 - Q Did you also try and take any kind of latent

- impressions whether they be footprint, fingerprint anything like that?
- A Yes, I did.

2.0

- Q In what areas did you try and take prints?
- A I worked in the -- on the doorways to the pantry closet which was on your left in the apartment, the floor in that area, the countertops of the kitchen counter, the stove, the telephone, a lot of the items that were recovered were subsequently processed later on. But in the apartment specifically the floor inside of the east bedroom near where the victim was laying, that was processed. The door to the closet in the -- leading towards the bathroom was processed for impressions, a multitude of areas.
- Q Okay. Do you have to narrow down where you're going to dust for impressions, or can you do the entire room?
- A Just out of a sheer time frame involvement, you kind of have to focus on what appears to be out of place or related somehow, but you believe it may be tied in or could be tied into this.
- Q Okay. In the Helen Sailor apartment, did you do just that: Focus on the areas that looked out of place, looked like they could have been touched

somehow? 1 2 Α Yes. 3 Q How did you attempt to identify or to see as you previously talked about any type of latent print? 4 Basically, at the scene I dusted just using the 5 Α dusting powders just like we've described before 6 7 just making them visible. Okay. And at that point in time, did you find some 0 8 type of latent print that you thought might be able 9 10 to be recovered? 11 Α Yes. 12 Q Let's go ahead and start with the latent markings 13 that you found on -- or in the kitchen area. 14Α Okay. Do you recall processing any part of the stove? 15 0 16 Α Yes. 17 Why did you process the stove? Because of it's proximity to where the victim was 18 Α located. It's near to where you would have to walk 19 20 in that area, and it could be touched, you know, it's -- it's a possibility. 21 Okay. Was there any specific area on the stove 22 23 that you were able to find some kind of a latent 24 impression you thought was worth collecting? 25 Α Yes. There were two areas.

Q What did you find?

2.0

- A On the -- as you face the stove now on the top left side, I recovered one latent impression that was up near the corner; and then I also located an impression down on the bottom right hand drawer, broiler drawer, clear at the very bottom and to the right.
 - Q The top left, what kind of an impression was that if you could tell?
 - A Well, it looked like a fingerprint impression, but it had ridge lines like a finger or palm impression.
 - Q Okay. Now, while we -- we aren't going to go into detail as far as your abilities to analyze fingerprints. Is that something that you've been trained to do?
 - A Not to the extent of a true identification work, no, ma'am.
 - Q Have you been to enough training that you can at least get a general feel whether it's a fingerprint or whether it's something that has enough quality or enough detail that it could possibly be processed further?
- A Yes.
- Q Okay. This print that you -- the latent impression

you found at the top left, did you believe it had 1 enough ridge detail that it might worth trying to 2 3 do something with later? Yes, it could be. 4 Α 5 Did you go ahead and take a lifter or preserve that print? 6 7 Α Yes. Let's now talk about the bottom right-hand corner. 8 9 What kind of a latent impression did that appear to 10 be? That was different. That -- it appeared as though 11 12 it could be like hair. It was linear in pattern. 13 It was just an odd impression. 14Okay. After the stove, do you remember moving into the what we'll call the bedroom or the room where 15 16 the body lie? 17 Α (No audible response.) Did you find anything that you tried to lift or 18 Q tried to preserve in there? 19 20 Α Yes. What areas? 21 Q Basically, in that main area I focussed on the 22 Α 23 floor because it was pretty much open. It was 24 obviously near to the victim's location. 25 Obviously, you would have to cross that path to get

to her position.

- 2 Q Okay. What did you do to process that area?
 - A I used dusting powders.
 - Q Were you able to see by using the dusting powder any kind of detail of an impression that you thought was able to be taken or preserved?
 - A There were several.
 - Q What did you do?
 - A I first after dusting it examined it further. I found several impressions, possible footwear impressions on the floor on the linoleum area.

 They were photographed, and their position was documented with measurements, and then they were collected.
 - Q How do you collect a footwear impression?
 - A In this particular case, I used adhesive lifters.

 It's just similar to a piece of tape, a big piece of tape; and then it has a backer on it to protect it so once you lift it, identify it, basically peel it up from whatever substance you would have placed it down onto and then you close it, and it adheres to itself.
 - Q Okay. Once it's closed, can it be reopened again?
 - A Not unless there was something causing it not to seal. A wet liquid could cause it to possibly

- 1 separate.
- Q Okay. Would there be obvious changes or
 manipulations in the paper, the backing, if
 something wet had touched it?
- 5 A Well --

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- Q Let me ask you this: Can you visually look at it and see whether it's been tampered with?
- A Oh, certainly, certainly.
- Q Okay. All right. Now, after you took these impressions of footwear detail, where did you go next?
- A I already had worked in that area, and then I moved to the bathroom area in the hallway, that small hallway.
- Q What did you dust, or what did you try to obtain prints from in that area?
 - A In the -- I was not able to locate any impressions upon the closet doors which I processed, but I also worked on the area of the bathroom floor. In there I did observe I believe it was one impression in that area. It had some detail present.
- Q Any areas -- or any other areas that you processed at this time?
 - A Well, prior to doing the kitchen, I had worked in the pantry area, and I had processed the floor in

that area and then also -- excuse me -- the doors 1 2 leading into that pantry. 3 Q Were you able to obtain any sample - or any samples of ridge detail or any samples of detail that you 4 thought might be available for further processing? 5 Α Yes. 6 What manner did you use to collect those items as 7 Q well? 8 The same which I described before with the adhesive 9 Α 10 lifters on the floor. Next I'm going to show you what's been marked for 11 Q 12 identification purposes as State's Exhibit 36. Do 13 you recognize this? 14 Α Yes, I do. What is it? 15 0 16 This is a photograph showing the lifter in place on Α the front of the stove the bottom right showing 17 it's location. 18 Okay. I'm now showing you what's been marked for 19 Q 20 identification purposes as State's Exhibit 37. Do you recognize this? 21 Yes, I do. 22 Α 23 What is it? Q 24 Α This is a view showing that same area on the stove 25 only in closer -- closer proximity showing the

1 impression that I observed.

Do you recognize this?

- Q Thank you. Next I'm showing you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 38.
- 5 A Yes, I do.

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

20

21

- Q What is it?
 - A This is a photograph showing the area what would be towards the west and slightly north from where the victim was located showing the impressions -- some of the impressions which I had obtained from that floor area.
 - Q Thank you. Next I'm showing you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 39.

 Do you recognize this?
- 15 A Yes, I do.
- 16 | Q What is it?
- 17 A This is the pantry door leading -- this is on the
 18 outside of the pantry door showing the location
 19 near the handle where I made a lift.
 - Q Okay. And then next I'd like to show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 40. Do you recognize this?
- 23 A Yes, I do.
- 24 O What is it?
- 25 A This is a photograph of the closet door in that

small hallway where there was that substance 1 2 located leading towards the bathroom. It's a close 3 view of it. Thank you. And all of these photographs; namely, 4 Q State's Exhibit 36 through and including what's 5 been identified as State's Exhibit 40, are these 6 7 accurate representations of what you personally observed while you were processing the Helen Sailor 8 apartment on November 29, 2002? 9 10 Α These actually -- they were not taken on that date. When were these taken? 11 0 12 These were taken the following day, the 30th. Α 13 Q Okay. Had you been processing the scene pretty 14much this entire time? I had gone home for a -- I finished at 15 Α 16 approximately midnight on the 29th and then came 17 back in, and it was about noon when I started the following day. 18 Had the scene been secured to your knowledge in the 19 Q 20 same manner as you described before prior to your coming back? 21 The doors were sealed and locked. I did not have 22 23 an officer standing on it all night long. 24 Did you check the seals before your entered again 25 on the 30th?

Α Yes. 1 Were they intact? 2 3 Α Yes, they were. Okay. Any reason to believe that they had been 4 Q tampered with in any way? Α No. 6 7 All right. Other than that, are they the same or Q substantially the same condition as they were when 8 you personally observed them while you were at 9 10 Helen Sailor's apartment? 11 А Yes. 12 Do you believe that these will assist the jury in 13 understanding your testimony and showing the detail of what you collected? 14 Yes, it will. 15 Α 16 Q Thank you. 17 MS. BECKER: State moves to admit what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 36 18 19 through 40 inclusive? 2.0 THE COURT: Mr. Zook any objections? MR. ZOOK: No, sir. 21 THE COURT: Mr. Crawford, any objections. 22 23 MR. CRAWFORD: No, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: State's Exhibits 36, 37, 38, 39 and 40 will be admitted without objection. 2.5

```
MS. BECKER: State moves for a publication of
 1
 2
      36 through 40 inclusive.
 3
                THE COURT: Any objections, counsel?
                MR. ZOOK: No, sir.
 4
 5
                MR. CRAWFORD: No, your Honor.
                THE COURT: State's Exhibit 36 through 40
 6
 7
      inclusive will be published without objection in the
      manner of choosing by the state.
 8
                MS. BECKER: State's Exhibit 36, 37, 38, 39,
 9
10
      40.
                     (State's Exhibit 36, 37, 38, 39 and 40
11
12
                     were published to the jury.)
13
                THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going
14
      to give you a break at this time. During the recess, I
      need to tell you. You are all jurors in this case. I
15
      must tell you now and I will repeat this again each time
16
17
      you are permitted to separate.
                Generally, you should not express any opinion
18
      about the case before it is submitted to you for
19
20
      deliberation; however, you are permitted to discuss the
21
      evidence presented in this case amongst yourselves in the
      jury room during recesses from trial. All jurors and
22
23
      alternates must be present during these discussions, and
24
      you must reserve judgment about the outcome of the case
2.5
      until your deliberations begin.
```

You are admonished that you may not discuss the 1 2 facts of the case with anyone other than your fellow 3 jurors. You may not discuss this case with me or with 4 the lawyers, parties or with any of the witnesses. 5 You should not listen to or read any outside or 6 7 media accounts of the trial. You may not investigate the case or attempt to obtain information outside the 8 courtroom. It is highly improper for you to do so. You 9 10 are to consider and decide this case only upon the evidence received during the course of the trial in the 11 12 courtroom. 13 (A short recess was taken.) 14 (The Court convened with all the 15 parties present. The jury entered the 16 courtroom and the following 17 proceedings were had.) THE COURT: Be seated, please. Ms. Becker. 18 BY MS. BECKER: 19 2.0 Now, detective, we just talked about those photographs about the latent processing that you 21 did. Can you explain for the jury what it takes to 22 23 leave a latent print whether it be fingerprint, 24 footprint, footwear impression, something like 25 that? Help us understand.

2.0

- A Basically, there's several different ways it could take place the actual process with regards to fingerprints, handprints. It's basically leaving -- for the most part -- leaving something behind. The oils from your skin, it could be a substance you have on your hand that was transferred and the residue that's left behind dries out and leaves an impression there. If you made an impression with, say, footwear or with your hand into something soft that would retain that impression, that could be possible also.
- Q So if you have clean hands, really clean hands, not even the oils on your hands are present, can you leave a print on anything you touch?
- A Not always. I mean, there's -- there's not 100 percent thing on this. It's -- it's -- sometimes it's left behind and sometimes it's not, or we're not able to locate it.
- Q In your experience processing crime scenes, it is usual that you actually do find fingerprints that are of such a quality that they can actually be compared to something else later?
- A I wouldn't say it's the norm. It's a -- most cases we don't end up with a lot of usable impressions.
- Q Why is that, or what is it -- why is it that it's

- so difficult to get a usable impression?
- A Because in order to be able to identify it, I mean, you've got to have specific detail present to do that for the examiners. And with normal activities when you think about it, if you take you hand and you lay it on the arm of your chair and you move your hand just as you would to get yourself up or move or shift, it smears. So that -- in that occasion, then, it's going to make that unusable.
 - Q Okay. So just because you touch something doesn't necessarily mean that it's going to leave a fingerprint or a latent print that you can use.
- A That's correct.
 - Q What exactly does latent mean?
- 15 A Hidden.
- 16 O Hidden?
- 17 A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

18

19

2.0

22

23

24

- Q Okay. And you indicated earlier that it's a process of becoming able to see it is what the dusting powder or other means are used for?
- 21 A Yes, that's correct.
 - Q Have you also made attempts at the scene of Helen Sailor to gather other types of prints? We've already talked about the hair, or what appeared to be the hair on the stove, you talked about the

- footwear, and you talked about some fingerprint
 impressions. Were there any other types of
 impressions that you tried to get?

 A Not really as far as impressions go, no.
 - A Not really as far as impressions go, no
 - Q All right. Now, talk about the footwear impressions. In your responsibilities as a detective technician, are you responsible for part of the evidence room and knowing what evidence is submitted in a case?
 - A Yes.

- Q All right. Were there several comparison footprints submitted in the case regarding Helen Sailor's homicide?
- A There were -- actually submitted into evidence, yes, there were several different shoes that had been submitted.
- Q Okay. Was there an attempt to make comparisons in the footwear impressions, or the latent footwear impressions that you found in the apartment?
- A Well, they were basically examined as far as the footwear that was recovered whether it was even remotely similar to what we observed at the scene, and then if that was -- and then there were others that were just sent to the laboratory for that testing or other testing.

- Q Now, it's a floor. Correct?
- 2 A Yes.

1

6

7

8

9

10

- Q Is there any way of knowing how long a latent
 impression that you may have been able to pick up
 came from that floor, or has been on that floor?
 - A In most circumstances, no.
 - Q Now, in this circumstance; namely, the fact that there was a body and then some liquid around that body, were there any latent impressions that appeared to be in that liquid or on top of that liquid?
- 12 A Yes.
- 13 Q Did you collect those?
- 14 A Yes.
- 15 Q All right. Did you make an attempt to identify 16 those?
- 17 A Yes. Those were sent to be identified.
- 18 Q Were they identified?
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 Q Was it a known person?
- 21 A Yes, it was.
- Q Okay. Was it someone that you had record had been in with the body? Actually, let me just ask you this. Who was it?
- 25 A It was Larry Converse's shoe.

- Q Okay. Now, were any of the other latent shoeprints in the liquid substance or clearly part of this crime scene?
- A No. Most of the others were in the surrounding areas nearby.
 - Q Okay. Is there any way that you could say with certainty that they were left by someone who would have been involved in this crime?
- A No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q Do you try and collect them anyway just in case?
- 11 A Make the attempt.
 - Q All right. And all of the latent prints -footprints that you collected, did you make
 attempts to have them identified them by sending
 them for processing or other means?
 - A Yes. If they were -- appeared to be usable impressions after you lifted them, yes, we did attempt it.
 - Q Okay. And based upon the footwear impressions, was an identity of a perpetrator ever found?
- 21 A No, no.
- Q Let's now talk about the fingerprint impressions.
- Were you able to get some fingerprint impressions
- that had enough ridge detail that you thought could
- 25 be used for later processing?

- 1 A Yes.
- Q Did you make lifters like you talked about before of those fingerprint impressions?
- 4 A Yes, I did.
- Specifically let's talk about some additional items
 that were admitted into evidence. Were there items
 that had been recovered from the trash chute that
 were admitted into evidence?
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q Now, did you retrieve some of those items at a
 11 later date for purposes of further processing?
- 12 A Yes, I did.
- Q What kind of items were they?
- 14 A They were, if I recall correctly, it was juice
 15 bottles and then an envelope I believe it was.
- Q Okay. Were there also some towels that were submitted into evidence from that same location?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q Okay. But can you process cloth for fingerprints?
- 20 A It is possible.
- 21 Q Did you do it in this case?
- 22 A No, I did not.
- 23 Q Are you familiar with how to do that?
- 24 A Vaguely, yes.
- Q Okay. Did you try and process the juice bottles?

Α Yes. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

17

18

- What kind of juice bottles were they?
 - The one -- I don't remember the brand name on the Α The one was an Ocean Spray, I believe, and one. then the other one I believe it was an Old Orchard brand.
 - I may I approach? Q THE COURT: You may.
- BY MS. BECKER:
- 10 I'm going to show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 41. Do you recognize this?
- 13 Α Yes, I do.
- 14 Q What is it?
- This is a photograph of the process of processing 15 Α the one Ocean Spray cranberry juice bottle. 16
 - Next I'm going to show you what's been marked for 0 identification purpose as State's Exhibit 42. Do you recognize this?
- 20 Yes, I do. Α
- 0 What is it? 21
- This is a photograph of that same bottle with 22 23 different adhesive lifters attached to it.
- 24 0 All right. Does this accurately demonstrate the 25 process that you go through in trying to make these

lifters from the print? 1 2 Α Yes. Does it also show a decent view of how to -- or of 3 all the different prints and latent marks on these 4 5 bottles that make it difficult for you to get lifters? 6 7 Could you rephrase that question, ma'am? Α Sure. Let me rephrase that question. Does this 0 8 also show the various other marks that are present 9 10 on these bottles that are also latent, in other words, they're brought up with the dusting powder? 11 12 Oh, yes, certainly. Α 13 Q And do those sometimes interfere with your 14 abilities to take ridge prints or fingerprints? Yes, they can. 15 Α All right. Do these two photos accurately 16 Q 17 represent what you personally observed when you processed this bottle? 18 19 Α Yes. 20 And do you believe that they will assist the jury Q in understanding your testimony? 21 22 Α Yes. 23 Q Thank you. 24 MS. BECKER: State would move to admit what's 2.5 been marked for identification purpose as State's

```
1
      Exhibits 41 and 42.
                THE COURT: Mr. Zook, any objections?
 2
 3
                MR. ZOOK: No, sir.
                THE COURT: Mr. Crawford, any objections?
 4
                MR. CRAWFORD: No, your Honor.
                THE COURT: Exhibits 41 and 42 will be admitted
 6
 7
      without objection.
                MS. BECKER: State would move to publish
 8
      State's Exhibit 41 and 42 in digital publication.
 9
10
                THE COURT: Any objection, counsel?
                MR. ZOOK: No, sir.
11
12
                MR. CRAWFORD: No, your Honor.
13
                THE COURT: Exhibits 41 and 42 will be
14
      published in any manner of choosing by the state without
      objection.
15
16
                MS. BECKER: 41, 42.
17
                     (State's Exhibits 41 and 42 were
18
                     published to the jury.)
      BY MS. BECKER:
19
2.0
            Now, detective, you indicated that you dusted for
            prints and -- fingerprints in numerous areas of the
21
            apartment, and in some circumstances you were able
22
23
            to take lifters. Correct?
24
        Α
           That's correct.
           Were those lifters submitted to laboratory or
25
```

1 submitted somewhere for further analysis? 2 Α Yes. 3 Q Were any of them of sufficient -- well, aside from one print on a tub, were any of them of sufficient 4 quality to be able to identify a perpetrator? 5 I can't really answer that. 6 7 Let me ask you this. Did -- the results that you Q got from the lab, did they assist in the 8 investigation in identifying the perpetrator? 9 10 Α No. Okay. Let's now talk about this plastic tub. May 11 12 I approach? 13 THE COURT: You may. 14 BY MS. BECKER: I'm going show you what's been marked for 15 16 identification purposes as State's Exhibit 43. Do 17 you recognize this? Yes, I do. 18 Α What is it? 19 Q 20 Α This is the plastic tub and then the medication bottles contained in it that was on the stove at 21 Helen Sailor's apartment. 22 23 Is this is the same plastic container that we saw 24 in the photograph previously? 25 Α Yes. Yes, it is.

All right. Now, other than the fact that this has 1 2 been repackaged and appears to have been processed, 3 does it appear to be in the same or substantially the same condition as it was when you personally 4 5 retrieved it from the Helen Sailor's apartment? The tub is substantially in the same condition. 6 7 The medications have -- appear to be shifted around. 8 9 All right. Just in their positioning? Q 10 Α Yes. Now, were some of these -- the plastic tub itself, 11 Q 12 was it processed for fingerprints? 13 Α Yes. Did you do that personally? 14Yes, I did. 15 Α 16 All right. Is that what the black coating is on Q the tub? 17 That's some of the dusting powder. 18 All right. And then I'd also liked to show you 19 Q 20 what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 44. Do you recognize this? 21 Yes, I do. 22 Α 23 What is it? Q These are three bottles of prescription type 24 Α 25 medication and a dosage cup that were on the

kitchen counter in front of the pill planners at 1 the apartment of Helen Sailor. 2 3 Q All right. Was there also a fourth bottle in front of the pill planners? 4 5 Yes, there was. Α Is that packaged in a different bag? 6 7 Yes, it is. Α All right. Did you process or attempt to process 0 8 all of these four bottles for latent prints? 9 10 Α Yes, I did. All right. And are these the only bottles that 11 Q 12 were separate on the counter which we saw in the 13 photograph earlier? 14 Yes. The only ones sitting out, yes. Did the -- other than that, are they in the same or 15 0 substantially the condition as they were when you 16 17 retrieved them? 18 Α Yes. 19 Q Thank you. 2.0 MS. BECKER: State would move to admit what's been marked for identification purposes as State's 21 Exhibit 43 and 44? 22 23 THE COURT: Counsel, any objection? 24 MR. ZOOK: No, sir. 25 MR. CRAWFORD: No, your Honor.

```
THE COURT: Exhibits 43 and 44 will be admitted
 1
 2
      without objection.
 3
                MS. BECKER: State would reserve publication at
      this time.
 4
 5
                THE COURT: All right.
      BY MS. BECKER:
 6
 7
            Detective, you indicated that you did process this
            medicine tub what's been identified as 43 for
 8
            latent prints. Correct?
 9
10
        Α
            That is correct.
            Were you able to see enough ridge detail anywhere
11
        Q
12
            on there to try and take some lifters for further
13
            processing?
14
           Yes, I did.
            How many, do you rememberer?
15
        0
            I believe it was eight.
16
        Α
            Were one of those lifters identified as lifter M?
17
18
        A
           Yes.
            From where or what area of the medicine tub did you
19
        Q
2.0
            take lifter M?
            From on the back side, the opposite side of where
21
        Α
            the label is located?
22
23
            All right. So if we look at State's Exhibit 43 and
24
            we see that the label is at the end of the bag
            where the exhibit sticker is --
25
```

- 1 A That's correct.
- Q -- what are you referring to the back side of the container?
- A The opposite side from the label. This side right here where I'm pointing now.
 - Q Okay. Did you photograph your process of taking lifter M at the time you were processing the medical tub?
- 9 A Yes.

7

8

10

11

12

19

20

- Q I'm going show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 45. Do you recognize this?
- 13 A Yes, I do.
- 14 Q What is it?
- 15 A This is a photograph of that tub with the lifters

 16 in place, or at least two sides are shown here,

 17 with the lifters in place with M, and you can see

 18 the edge of H.
 - Q Okay. Does this photograph accurately depict what you were observing as you processed the medical container?
- 22 A Yes, it did.
- Q Thank you. Does it also show the positioning of that lifter on the medical container?
- 25 A Yes.

- Q Do you believe this will assist the jury in understanding your testimony?
- A Yes, it will.

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

16

17

18

21

22

- Q And was that done at the same time that you processed that medical container subsequent to recovering it from Helen Sailor's apartment?
 - A The photograph was taken when it was processed, yes, ma'am.
 - Q Thank you. Next I'd like to show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's

 Exhibit 46. Do you recognize this?
- 12 A Yes, I do.
- 13 Q What is it?
- A This is the lifter which was depicted in the previous photograph identified as M.
 - Q Okay. Now, there are two chunks out of the center of that lifter. What are those chunks representing?
- 19 A I believe those were removed from the lifter during
 20 the subsequent laboratory processing.
 - Q All right. Did you request certainly laboratory processing that would require them having a piece removed?
- 24 A Yes.
- Q What kind of processing would that have been?

Α Processing the -- the -- what's in between the 1 adhesive lifter and the backer for DNA. 2 3 Q Oaky. Did -- or were there chunks taken out of areas that effected identifying this print to your 4 5 knowledge? Not to my knowledge. 6 7 Okay. And does what's been identified as State's Q Exhibit 46 appear to be in same or substantially 8 the same condition as it was when you took it off 9 10 the medical tub except for the two chunks taken 11 out? 12 Except for the chunks, and there's several other Α 13 markings on this that weren't there at that point 14 in time. Do you recognize the markings? 15 0 They appear to be laboratory markings. 16 Α 17 Are they markings that you're familiar with? 18 Α Yes. 19 Q Thank you. 2.0 MS. BECKER: State now moves to admit what's been marked for identification purposes as State's 21 Exhibit 45 and 46. 22 23 THE COURT: Counsel, any objections? 24 MR. ZOOK: No, sir.

MR. CRAWFORD: No, your Honor.

```
THE COURT: Exhibits 45 and 46 will be admitted
 1
 2
      without objection.
 3
                MS. BECKER: State would move to publish
      State's Exhibit 45 by digital publication and 46 by
 4
 5
      passing to the jury.
 6
                THE COURT: Any objection?
 7
                MR. ZOOK: No, sir.
                MR. CRAWFORD: No, your Honor.
 8
                THE COURT: State's Exhibit 45 and 46 will be
 9
10
      published in the manner of choosing by the state.
                     (State's Exhibit 45 and 46 was
11
12
                     published to the jury.)
13
                THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, take as long
14
      as you wish to examine Exhibit No. 46. It's being passed
      amongst you. These exhibits will be sent, generally
15
      speaking, to the jury room with you during your
16
17
      deliberations. You'll have another opportunity to
      examine them at that time.
18
19
      BY MS. BECKER:
2.0
            Now, detective, after you were able to process the
            medical tub and you were able to get lifter M, did
21
            it appear to you to have enough ridge detail that
22
23
            you thought it might be sufficient for comparison
24
            purposes?
25
        Α
            Yes.
```

- Q Were you instructed to obtain another print, or a sample print, for purposes of submitting for comparison?
- A Yes.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

- 5 Q Where did you go to obtain a sample print?
 - A From -- it was a print card, and I obtained that at the Elkhart Police Department Records Division.
 - Q Okay. Does the Elkhart Police Department keep certain records in the normal course of their business?
- 11 A Yes, they do.
- 12 Q Among those do you have fingerprint cards on record?
- 14 A Yes, we do.
- 15 Q Next I'm going to show you what's been marked for
 16 identification purposes as State's Exhibit 47.
 17 Take a look at that. Do you recognize this?
- 18 A Yes, I do.
- 19 Q What is it?
- 20 A This is a Elkhart Police Department fingerprint
 21 card with inked impressions on it.
- 22 Q Okay. Where did you obtain this?
- 23 A From the records division.
- Q Okay. Did you personally seal it?
- 25 A Yes, I did.

- Q Is this the same fingerprint card that you submitted for purposes of comparison?
- A Yes, it is.

2.0

- Q To whom did you submit this card for purposes of comparison?
 - A To Detective Chapman with the Elkhart County
 Sheriff's Department.
 - Q Why did you submit a fingerprint to Detective
 Chapman with the Elkhart County Sheriff's
 Department?
 - A Because he's a latent prints examiner?
- Q Okay. Why didn't you just send the latent print, the fingerprint, with this much detail to the Indiana State Police Lab?
 - A Because it was requested we go through him because he could get it done sooner so -- because he would be able to start his examination sooner.
 - Q In your experience with the Indiana State Police
 Lab, how long does it typically take to get
 fingerprint comparisons done?
 - A It varies a great deal, depends on their -- their bag lock. Anywhere -- I've had them come back within a few months, and sometime it's been several years.
- Q What about DNA testing?

Pretty much more than a year is the routine. 1 Α Now, after you were able to gather all of the 2 Q evidence that you collected from Helen Sailor's 3 apartment whether it be the latent fingerprint or 4 the latent ridge detail, whatever you could get, 5 the foot impressions, samples of bodily fluids from 6 7 the autopsy or what from what you got around the scene or the items at the scene, did you submit 8 some of these items to the Indiana State Police 9 10 lab? 11 Yes. 12 Why did you do that? 13 Α For further testing in an attempt to identify the 14 contributor. Other than lifter M, that fingerprint, was the lab 15 able to assist in identifying another perpetrator? 16 17 Α No. MS. BECKER: No further questions at this time. 18 19 THE COURT: Mr. Zook. 2.0 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ZOOK: 21 Good morning, Joel? 22 23 Good morning, sir. Α 24 0 I understand that you got a jewelry box from 25 underneath a bed. Is that right?

- A Yes, sir.

 Q Was that actually a jewelry box?
- 3 A It appeared to be to me.
- 4 Q It did?
- 5 A Yes, sir.
- Q Okay. It looks kind of like a tool box from the front.
- 8 A Well, it was a -- if I recall right, it was like 9 padded like naugahyde or facsimile leather.
- 10 Q What was in it?
- 11 A There were Ziplock bags containing jewelry item.
- 12 looked like costume jewelry type items.
- Q Okay. Did it appear to be relatively full or empty?
- 15 A There were numerous items in it. I don't recall
 16 how packed it seemed to me.
- Q Okay. And did you find any pieces of rope?
- 18 A Any pieces of rope, sir?
- 19 Q Pieces of rope in the apartment?
- 20 A No, sir.
- Q Did you check in the chute, the chutes going down
- from the tenth floor where you would throw garbage?
- 23 A I did not search that area, sir.
- 24 Q It wasn't searched?
- 25 A No. I -- I did not search that area, no, sir.

- Q You found some towels. Those would be towels that
 were found in the apartment.
 - A No. I did not recover any towels.
- 4 Q Oh, you didn't.
 - A No, sir.

5

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Q I thought you'd said there were some things that
 you didn't fingerprint that were of that nature?
 - A There were towels recovered, but I didn't personally recover those items, sir.
- 10 Q Okay. And you don't know where they were recovered from?
 - A I would -- to the best of my knowledge, they were recovered from the trash chute and dumpster area.
 - Q Okay. Now, were there -- did you dust all of the pill bottles?
 - A All of the pill bottles. No. I did not dust the ones that were inside of that tub that we talked about earlier.
- 19 Q Why wouldn't you dust those?
- 20 A Because it appeared -- from how they were
 21 positioned when I recovered them, it didn't really
 22 look like they had been rifled through or gone
 23 through. They were just seated in there at that
 24 position.
- Q Okay. Okay. And the only -- the only matching

1 shoe was from a relative of the deceased. Is that 2 right? 3 Α I believe he's a relative, sir, yes. And someone who is recognized to have been in the 4 Q 5 apartment --Yes, sir. 6 Α 7 -- since the time of the death. Q Α That's correct, sir. 8 MR. ZOOK: Pass the witness. 9 THE COURT: Mr. Crawford. 10 MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you, your Honor. 11 12 CROSS-EXAMINATION 13 BY MR. CRAWFORD: 14 Officer, I want to make sure I'm clear. You tested 15 the kitchen area I believe you mentioned for latent 16 prints. Is that correct? 17 Α Portions of it, yes, sir. The stove area specifically. Right? 18 Q 19 Α Yes. 20 Q You also mentioned that you took shoe prints in the bedroom, is that correct, or took prints --21 possible prints or -- of shoe prints? 22 23 Yes. Not in the kitchen, sir. Α 24 Q Right. 25 Α Okay.

- 0 In the bedroom. 1
- 2 Α Yes.
- 3 Q Did you take any prints or attempt to take any prints of the dresser drawers? 4
- 5 Α Yes.
- And were those also passed on to the state police 6 7 lab?
- Α I didn't -- I didn't recall -- or recover any 8 usable impressions from those areas. 9
 - Q Okay. Did you attempt to obtain prints from the -what you called the jewelry box?
- 12 Α Yes.

11

16

17

21

22

23

- 13 Q And were any of those prints sent to the state lab?
- 14Α If I recall correctly, I did not obtain any usable impressions off of that box. 15
- Now, I believe you also mentioned during Q cross-examination that there was some jewelry still in the box. Is that correct? 18
- Yes, I believe there was. It was in a Ziplock --19 Α 20 small Ziplock bags.
 - And of the one person -- again, I want to make sure Q I'm clear -- for the footprints, it was just one that came back, is that correct, someone you can identify?
- 25 Right. As I -- to the best of my recollection,

607 STATE'S WITNESS - JOEL BOURDON - (REDIRECT) 1 there was just one impression that was identified. I think you also mentioned during direct 2 0 examination that cloth could be processed. Is that correct? 4 It does have the possibility as my understanding 5 6 for it, yes, sir. 7 But that was not done with the particular cloth towels that were recovered in this case. Is that 8 9 correct? That is correct, sir. 10 Α Thank you. No further questions. 11 Q 12 THE COURT: Ms. Becker. 13 MS. BECKER: Just briefly, your Honor. 14 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. BECKER: 15 Do you know which officer searched the trash chute 16 17 outside of Helen Sailor's apartment? I know one of the officers that did that. 18 Α 19 Who was that? 0 Detective D'Andre Christian. 20 Α Did you have in your evidence room under this case 21 0 number submissions from the trash chute from 22 23 D'Andre Christian? 24 Α Yes. In fact, the two primary juice bottles that we 25

STATE'S WITNESS - JOEL BOURDON - (RECROSS) 1 talked about were those from the trash chute according to the evidence log? 2 Α I don't know that the one was a cranberry juice bottle, but the juice bottles, yes, there were, I 4 believe, two submitted by her along with additional 6 towels. 7 Okay. When was that trash chute searched, do you know on or about? 8 That was -- that was searched -- that was done on 9 Α the 29th of November, 2002. 10 Okay. Now, as you were processing this scene for 11 Q prints that was just discussed, while you were 12 doing that, did you find lots of different smears? 13 14Α Numerous smears, yes, ma'am. I don't have any further questions. Thank you. 15 0 THE COURT: Mr. Zook, any other questions? 16 17 MR. ZOOK: Yes, sir. RECROSS-EXAMINATION 18 BY MR. ZOOK: 19 Joel, you're the -- you are a custodian of the 20 Q evidence. Is that right? 21 One of them, sir. 22 Α 23 You and at least one other person. Yes, sir. 24 Α To your -- best of your recollection, was any rope 25

```
STATE'S WITNESS - JOEL BOURDON - (RECROSS)
 1
            submitted into evidence?
            Any rope. Not to the best of my remembrance, sir.
 2
        Α
        Q
            Okay. Did you dust the key chain for prints?
            When you say "the key chain," sir, are we
        Α
 4
            discussing the heart shaped key chain?
            The -- the -- the heart shaped --
 6
        Q
 7
            Yes, I did; yes, I did.
        Α
            Was any print found on that?
 8
        0
            No. I did not obtain any usable impressions from
 9
        Α
            that.
10
            Thank you. No more questions.
11
        Q
                MR. CRAWFORD: No questions, your Honor.
12
                MS. BECKER: Nothing further.
13
14
                THE COURT: You may step down, sir. Watch your
15
      step. Call your next witness.
16
                MS. BECKER: Thank you. State would call Betty
17
      Cross. Can this witness be released from his subpoena?
                MR. ZOOK: Yes.
18
19
                MR. CRAWFORD: Yes.
20
                THE COURT: He will be released.
21
                MS. BECKER: Thank you, your Honor.
                THE COURT: Would you raise your right hand,
22
23
      please.
24
                     (The witness was sworn.)
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
25
```

THE COURT: Take the witness stand, please. 1 BETTY CROSS 2 3 called on behalf of the State, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: 4 DIRECT EXAMINATION 5 BY MS. BECKER: 6 7 Good morning, ma'am, would you please introduce Q yourself to our jury? 8 My name is Betty Cross. 9 Α 10 0 Betty, what do you do for a living? I'm a records manager for the Elkhart City Police 11 Α 12 Department. 13 Q How long have you been the records manager for the 14 Elkhart City Police Department? Three years now. 15 Α 16 In the course of your duties as the records 17 manager, is it your responsibility to ensure that the records of the Elkhart Police Department are 18 kept safe and secure in your facility? 19 2.0 А Yes. Are these records that are kept in the normal 21 course of business at the Elkhart Police 22 23 Department? 24 Α Yes. Okay. I'd like to show you what's been marked for 25

1 identification purposes as State's Exhibit 47 and ask you to take a look at this, please. 2 3 Α (This witness complied.) Do you recognize this? 4 5 Α Yes. What is it? 6 Q 7 It's a palm print card. Α What is a palm print card? 8 0 It is a print of the -- of a -- a person that's 9 Α 10 arrested. Okay. And does -- when the fingerprints are taken, 11 Q 12 are these records that's are kept in the normal 13 course of business of the Elkhart Police 14Department? Yes. 15 Α Are they taken by a person with knowledge of what's 16 Q 17 going on; namely, the officer that's doing the print taking? 18 19 Α Yes. 20 Q All right. Is the identifying information of the person that's giving the print recorded on the card 21 as well? 22 23 Yes. Α 24 Q All right. Does there name appear on that card? 25 Α Yes, it does.

```
1
           Are these records that are kept in the normal
            course of business of the Elkhart Police Department
 2
 3
            from records that are made at or near the time of
            the observation?
 4
 5
        Α
           Yes.
            Okay. And are they kept as a regular business
 6
 7
            activity of the police department?
        Α
           Yes.
 8
            Okay. Thank you. No further questions.
 9
        Q
                THE COURT: Mr. Zook.
10
                MR. ZOOK: No questions.
11
12
                MR. CRAWFORD: No questions, your Honor.
13
                THE COURT: You may step down. Watch your
14
      step, please. Is she released, Mr. Zook?
15
                MR. ZOOK: Yes.
16
                MR. CRAWFORD: Yes.
                THE COURT: She'll be released from her
17
      subpoena. Call your next witness.
18
                MS. BECKER: State would call Detective Dennis
19
20
      Chapman.
21
                THE COURT: Would you raise your right hand,
      sir?
22
23
                     (The witness was sworn.)
24
                MR. WILLIAMS: I do.
25
                THE COURT: Take the witness stand, please.
```

1		DENNIS CHAPMAN
2	calle	d on behalf of the State, having been first duly
3	sworn	, testified as follows:
4		DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY MS. BECKER:	
6	Q	Could you please tell us who you are?
7	A	Dennis Chapman. I'm a detective with the Elkhart
8		County Sheriff's Department.
9	Q	How long have you been a detective with the Elkhart
10		County Sheriff's Department, Detective Chapman?
11	A	I've been a detective six years.
12	Q	Okay. How long have you worked at the Elkhart
13		County Sheriff's Department?
14	A	In November it will be 12 years with the sheriff's
15		department.
16	Q	Prior to that, what did you do?
17	A	I worked in a juvenile detention for six years in
18		Elkhart County.
19	Q	Prior to that?
20	A	I worked the juvenile detention in Berrien County,
21		Michigan.
22	Q	Okay. And then prior to that?
23	A	I was in training for the U.S. border patrol.
24	Q	That's okay. We need to keep going back. What did
25		you do before the border patrol?

- A And before that I worked as security at the Cook

 Nuclear plant, Bridgeman, Michigan.
 - Q I'm sorry, what?
- 4 A I worked security at the Cook Nuclear Plant in Bridgeman, Michigan.
- 6 O The Cook Nuclear Plant?
- 7 A Right.

16

- Q All right. Prior to that, that's the important part, what did you do?
- 10 A I worked for the FBI.
- 11 Q What did you do for the FBI?
- 12 A I was a fingerprint examiner.
- Q How long were you a fingerprint examiner for the FBI?
- 15 A Approximately two years.
 - Q Now, not to date you, but when did you actually begin your service with the FBI?
- 18 A It was February of 1976.
- Q Okay. In February of 1976, was the FBI using computers for fingerprint classifications?
- 21 A No, they were not.
- Q Okay. When you began working for the FBI, what kind of training did you have to obtain?
- A I went through 12 weeks of training how to classify
 and examine presents.

Q Okay. What do you mean by classify prints?

- A Well, at the time, the FBI -- the whole seventh floor of the FBI headquarters in Washington was filled with file cabinets, and the fingerprint cards were all filed in there, and they were classified according to female, male, and they were broken down so you could search them easily.

 Each -- there was 26 units on that floor, and each unit was broke up so it would be easier to search.
 - They were not searched by name, but they were searched by classification.
- Q All right. So for example, somebody would submit a fingerprint to you and say find me the comparison.

 What would you do?
- A First thing you'd do would be classify the print and find out which unit you would go to.
- Q And when you say "classify," do you break a print down according to the types of characteristics that it shows?
- A Right. It would be the type of patterns that were in each finger.
- Q And once you're able to break it down into those, can you at least limit your search to a smaller number?
- 25 A A smaller number, yes.

- Q Even though you could classify a print and get it down to a smaller number, how many print cards would you have to look at in order to make a comparison?
- A Well, the standard was -- say, the last card you would search by would be a ridge count of ten. You always have to search from either five to 15, so you'd have several prints, sometimes hundreds of prints in one search.
- Q Okay. And how would you actually compare?
- A You would look at each card individually.
 - Q Okay. What kind of an instrument did you use in order to look at these cards and make comparisons?
 - A We had little magnifying glasses that we look through.
 - Q And how many years did you spend doing this?
- 17 A Two years.

- Q All right. After you left the FBI, did you later then have to use your fingerprint skills again?
 - A When I worked at Cook Plant, occasionally they would ask me if these prints -- for background checks on certain individuals asked me if they were all right to be submitted, and I would look at them.
- Q Okay. When you came to the Elkhart County

Sheriff's Department and became a detective, what 1 were part of your duties? 2 3 Α As initially, I was assigned investigations, but they would also ask for me to look at prints 4 because they knew I had the fingerprint training. 5 Okay. Did everybody kind of come to you and say 6 7 can you help? Yes, they did. Α 8 All right. And based upon that, did you start 9 Q 10 doing that on a more regular basis? In the fall of 2000, I attended a Integrated 11 12 Indiana Law Enforcement Crime Scene Training 13 School; and after that of course, then I was 14 assigned to lab full time. Okay. And in the lab as a full time detective 15 16 technician, is it one of your responsibilities to 17 examine as well compare fingerprints? Yes, it is. 18 Α Based upon your experience, have you been able to 19 Q 20 make fingerprint comparisons in the past several years? 21 Yes, I have. 22 23 Any idea how many comparisons you've made? 24 Α Not right off the top of my head. Several -- maybe 25 100 or so.

- Q Okay. I'd like to show you what has been -actually, before we do that. Let's talk a little
 bit about fingerprints. Do you also have training
 and experience in attempting to recover latent
 prints from a crime scene?
 - A Yes.

7

8

18

19

20

21

- Q Is that part of your responsibilities at the sheriff's department?
- 9 A Yes, it is.
- 10 Q In your experience, do you often find fingerprints 11 at a crime scene?
- 12 A Not often.
- 13 Q Why not?
- A A lot of it depends on the surface you're trying
 fingerprint and the type of surface it is. Glass
 is pretty easy but most other surfaces it's
 difficult to get prints off of.
 - Q Okay. Are there certain external things that effect whether a fingerprint is left or not?
 - A Yes. Weather will effect it, and the type of surface; and if someone is a secretor or not if they leave prints behind.
- 23 Q What does a secretor mean?
- A Someone sweats a lot, or if they have -- sometimes
 people wear gloves (unintelligible) T.V. too

- they'll wear gloves at scenes.
 - Q Okay. And what if your hands are really clean, like you've washed them?
 - A The more likely is difficult to leave sometimes.
 - Q The older that you get, does that effect the quality of prints?
- 7 A Yes, it does.
 - Q Why?

- A Depending on a person's career. If someone -- if they work in a factory or something they get -- their fingerprints get worn a lot, and they get scatches. Even if someone who sits in the tub -- we've done that for a long time, you know, your fingers get wrinkly after that.
- Q Do all of these things effect your ability to recover a print?
- 17 A Yes, it does.
 - Q When you're looking at fingerprints and when you were doing your classifications not only for the FBI but when you examine them now, what kinds of things do you look for?
 - A I look for types of pattern, how good the ridges are. The ridges are the little lines you see on your fingers.
 - Q In addition to the lines that you see, do those

620 lines have certain characteristics such as stops, 1 starts, dots, those kinds of things that are 2 important in your classifications? 3 Yes, all those. 4 Α All right. I'd like to show you what's been marked 5 for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 47. 6 7 Do you recognize this? Yes, I do. Α 8 What is it? 9 Q 10 Α It's a fingerprint card from the Elkhart City Police Department. 11 12 Did you personally use this fingerprint card to Q 13 attempt to make a classification or -- I'm sorry --14 a comparison? Yes, I did. 15 Α 16 All right. When did you do that? Q 17 Α (unintelligible) we received these prints in August 29th from Joel, I believe, it's 2003. 18 Okay. Thank you. Next I would like to show you 19 Q 2.0 what has been marked for identification purposes --I'm sorry. It's been admitted into evidence as 21 State's Exhibit 46. Do you recognize this? 22 23 Yes, I do. Α 24 0 What is it?

This is a loose card with a -- latent prints on it.

0 Where did you receive this latent print card? 1 I received this from Detective Bourdon of Elkhart 2 Α 3 City Police Department at the same time I received the fingerprint card. 4 Were you asked to perform any specific examination 5 Q on these two things? 6 7 Yes. I -- along with this, I received several Α other fingerprint lifts and fingerprint cards. I 8 was asked to see if I could make a comparison from 9 10 those? 11 Okay. Thank you. And let me ask you. Were you 12 able to make a comparison from the fingerprint card 13 in state's -- what's identified as State's Exhibit 14 47 and what is entered into evidence as State's Exhibit 46? 15 16 Yes, I was. Α 17 MS. BECKER: Thank you. State would now move to admit what's been marked for identification purposes 18 19 as State's Exhibit 47. 2.0 THE COURT: Mr. Crawford, any objection? MR. CRAWFORD: No objection, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Mr. Zook, any objection? 22 23 MR. ZOOK: No, sir. 24 THE COURT: Exhibit 47 will be admitted without objection. 25

1 BY MS. BECKER: Detective, I'm now showing you again State's 2 3 Exhibit 47. What is the name or the signature on the top left of that card? 4 5 Α Lana R. Canen. 6 0 Thank you. 7 MS. BECKER: State would move to publish State's Exhibit 47 to the jury by passing? 8 THE COURT: Any objection. 9 10 MR. ZOOK: No, sir. MR. CRAWFORD: No, objection, your Honor. 11 12 THE COURT: Exhibit 47 will be published in the 13 manner of choosing by the state. 14 (State's Exhibit 47 was published to the jury.) 15 16 BY MS. BECKER: Detective Chapman, let's talk a little bit about 17 how you made your comparison. First of all, did 18 you have to use something in order to examine 19 2.0 State's Exhibit 46, namely, lifter M, for the purpose of even finding a print on here? 21 Yes. I needed a magnifying glass to look at that. 22 23 What kind of a magnifying glass did you use? 24 Α It's a little instrument. We've used the same type 25 at the FBI just a little black instrument with two

magnifying glasses in it. You can adjust it for 1 2 your eyes? 3 Okay. After you were able to locate the print on lifter M, did you try and locate any others that 4 might have enough ridge detail or enough detail to 5 make some kind of a comparison as well? 6 7 Initially that's what I did with all the Α lifters. I checked those out see if there was any 8 prints on there that I could examine. 9 10 0 Did any of the other lifters or anywhere else on lifter M have anything that had enough detail for 11 12 you to make a comparison? 13 Α There was slight detail, but not enough to make a 14 comparison. Now, after you were able to enlarge with your glass 15 0 16 and look at what was on lifter M the one print that 17 had enough detail, what did you do? I examined the cards I had. I examined first the 18 Α suspect cards. 19 20 Okay. Were you able to notice certain Q characteristic about the print that was on lifter M 21 that you were looking for in the suspect card? 22 23 I knew it was a loop. So I was looking for a Α 24 loop on the fingerprint cards themselves. 25 Q What's a loop?

- A That would be where the ridges would all flow through at one side, present a different pattern whirls, loops, arches; and I was looking for a loop specifically that I eliminated the ones on the card that were not loops.
- Q All right. What's a whirl?
- A Whirl would be there would be two deltas which doesn't mean much.
- Q Try and explain it best as you can to us?
- A Okay. A delta would be -- there would be two doubles outside of a whirl where a loop is going to have one delta, and it be the -- for a whirl would be almost like little circles, like a lot of people refer to them as swirls, which is termed as a whirl. An arch would be they flow on one side and smoothly out the other side.
- Q Are there also characteristics such as stops and starts of ridges that are unique for individuals?
- A Ridges, yes they would be, yes.
 - Q In all your time examining fingerprints whether it be for the FBI or through your career until present, have there ever been any literature or anything else that has found -- or that more than one person has the same fingerprint?
- 25 A No.

- Q So the rumor about people having unique prints, is that true?
- A Yes.

- Q What about identical twins?
- A They have different prints as well.
 - Q All right. So when you're looking for these characteristics such as whirls or loops or deltas or ridge detail, are you able to narrow down quickly based upon finding a specific pattern?
- 10 A Yes.
 - Q Were you able to look at any of the these suspects cards and find something that matched the pattern you found in M?
 - A Yes. It was on fingerprint card of Lana's.

lifter M from the medical tub?

- Q All right. I'm going to give you back State's

 Exhibit 47, which is Lana Canen fingerprint card.

 Which finger were you able to find the -- at least
 the characteristics that were consistent with
- A First fingerprint, that was her right index finger cause that one had the same flow as a little bit that was on the lift card, but that did not match at all.
- Q So after you got past it had the characteristics, further investigation showed it wasn't the same.

- A Right. So I knew it couldn't come from the right hand because it was gonna' have to be an ulnar loop, and the ulnar loop can only be from the left hand.
- Q Okay. What's an ulnar loop?
- A Ulnar loop -- they would all flow towards the -they would start in the upper hand and flow this
 way for right a finger. For the left finger, they
 flow the opposite way. And her right index finger
 is a radial loop, which flows the opposite way.
- Q Okay. So you've got an ulnar loop, and now you're looking at the left card.
- A Right.

- Q What do you find on the left side?
- A On the left thumb's a whirl, so that eliminates that right away. The right index finger possibly could be a whirl so it was eliminated as well and a left ring was a whirl, possibly a loop. This is done visually cause when we used to look at a card, we didn't have the time to -- actually, we were on a production. My last unit I was in I had to do 40 prints an hour so classify these real quick you try to pick out a finger to go search by because you're looking at the same pattern all fingerprints you're looking at. But you have to find one that's a

- little bit different than the others so you would (unintelligible) then you would flip through the different fingerprint cards and try to find that one which matched. Then you would -- the last thing you would do is use your magnifying glass to verify it.

 Were you able to use your magnifying glass and
- Q Were you able to use your magnifying glass and verify any of the prints from Lana's left hand?
- A Yes. The left little finger.
- Q The left little finger.
- A Yes.

2.0

- Q Now, so if I give you fingerprint lifter M, which is State's Exhibit 46, back and ask you where did the fingerprint that was found on M come from based upon your examination, what would you conclude?
- A Well, I examined this previously. I know it's -- I made this little cut that's in here right now.
- Q Okay. And based upon the examination that you did comparing M to Lana's fingerprint card, what did find?
- A That they match. So the same points on each of those prints.
- Q All right. After you made the actual comparison finding that that print was Lana Canen's little left finger, did you make any enlargements for

628 purposes of explaining your testimony? 1 Yes, I did. 2 Α 3 Q What did you make? I placed those two on the scanner and blew those 4 А 5 up. I'd like to show you what's been marked for 6 7 identification purchase as State's Exhibit 48. Do you recognize this? 8 Yes, I do. 9 Α 10 0 What is it? This is a blown up of the latent print left little 11 12 finger. 13 Q Okay. Which one are you referring to? Where did 14 get this one? This was off the lift card. 15 16 Q Okay. Next, I'd like to show you what's been 17 marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 49. What is that? 18 It is a blown up of the fingerprint card left 19 Α 20 little finger. Okay. Is that from State's Exhibit 47? 21 Q 22 Α Yes. 23 Okay. The items contained in what's identified as 24 State's Exhibits 48 and 49, are these true and

accurate representations that you made enlarged

from what's -- or what's been entered into evidence 1 as State's Exhibits 46 and 47 for purposes of 2 3 illustrating your testimony? Yes, they are. 4 Α Are they accurate representations of what you 5 personally observed under that enlargement glass? 6 7 Α Yes. All right. Do these show the points of what you 0 8 made your comparison? 9 10 Α Yes, they do. Thank you. Did you also find some ridge on another 11 Q 12 one of the lifter prints? 13 Α Yes, I did. 14 Do you recall from what surface that lifter had been taken? 15 16 Not right off hand. Α 17 0 All right. For illustration purposes, were you able to make an enlargement of that lifter as well? 18 I did at the time. 19 Α 20 Q Okay. I'd like to show you what's been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 50. Do 21 you recognize this? 22 23 Yes, I do. Α 24 0 What is it? 25 That's the enlargement of the lifter.

0 Okay. Which lifter would that we? 1 From the -- it was a different lifter. It wasn't 2 Α 3 this lifter here. I don't recall which one it was right off hand. 4 Why did you make this enlargement? 5 Q Α To see if I could match it up a little better with 6 7 the fingerprint -- from the fingerprint card. Okay. Were you able to actually match this to a 0 8 degree of certainty that you were comfortable with? 9 10 Α No, I was not. 11 Did it show similar characteristics such that you 12 thought it would be possible? 13 Α Yes, it was possible. 14 MS. BECKER: Thank you. State would now move like to admit what's been marked for identification 15 16 purposes as State's Exhibits 48, 49, and 50. 17 THE COURT: Mr. Crawford, any objection? MR. CRAWFORD: No, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Mr. Zook, any objection. 19 2.0 MR. ZOOK: Objection to State's Exhibit 50. I think by the testimony of the witness this would not be 21 admissible as -- as not showing sufficient indicia of 22 23 reliability. 24 THE COURT: Counsel approach, please. (An off-the-record discussion was held 25

at the bench.) 1 THE COURT: Exhibits 48 and 49 will be admitted 2 3 without objection. Exhibit 50 will not be admitted. MS. BECKER: State would reserve publication 4 just for a few moments in those. 5 THE COURT: All right. 6 7 BY MS. BECKER: Now, detective, when you are looking at prints you 8 indicated you look for this whirl or a loop or arch 9 10 that kind of thing, look for other stops and starts. Do you mark those or do you identify them 11 12 somehow so that you can make ready reference to 13 them to show why you did what you did? 14 Α On the enlargements I do. Okay. Referring back to State's Exhibit 49 and 15 0 16 then also State's Exhibit 48, why did you put the 17 markings that you did on these two pieces of evidence? 18 The markings correspond with the same on each print 19 Α 2.0 so I can show for the audience to look at and see -- possibly show that where they match up. 21 Okay. Now, what is in State's Exhibits 48, 49, are 22

size on the ratio scale?

23

24

25

they exactly the same angle or exactly the same

```
Okay. But do they give a reference to the jury so
 1
            that they can get a better idea of what you looked
 2
 3
            at?
        Α
            Yes.
 4
 5
                MS. BECKER: State would now move to publish
      State's Exhibits 48 and 49.
 6
 7
                THE COURT: Mr. Zook.
                MR. ZOOK: No objection.
 8
                THE COURT: Mr. Crawford.
 9
10
                MR. CRAWFORD: No objection, your Honor.
                THE COURT: Exhibits 48 and 49 will be
11
12
      published without objection in the manner of choosing of
13
      the state.
14
                     (State's Exhibit 48 was published to
15
                     the jury.)
16
      BY MS. BECKER:
17
            Okay. 48 what was that again?
            This is a latent print from the print lift -- a
18
        Α
            lifter.
19
20
            So lifter M, which was off the medical container.
        Q
21
            Right?
22
        Α
            Yes.
23
            And you've identified several points on here. How
24
            many points did you actually identify that were
            unique?
25
```

1 Α Several for illustrative purposes. And then on the inked print or; namely, the print 2 Q from the print card of Lana Canen, how many points 3 did you identify here? 4 Seven. There's a couple missing off to the side 5 Α there numbers. 6 7 And this is actually State's Exhibit 49. And then Q going back to 48 are they supposed to correspond, 8 or are they the same things that you've identified? 9 10 Α Yes. Forty-nine. 11 0 12 (State's Exhibit 49 was published to 13 the jury.) 14 MS. BECKER: I don't have any further questions thank you all. 15 THE COURT: Mr. Zook. 16 17 MR. ZOOK: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION 18 19 BY MR. ZOOK: 20 Detective Chapman, I see there are seven points that you numbered as being similar between the 21 latent print and the ink print. Is that right? 22 23 That's correct. Α Wasn't the old FBI standard ten points of 24 0 comparison? 25

- 1 A There is no standard.
- Q Was there a standard of comparison of ten points at one point?
- 4 A Not when I went to school.
 - Q Not when you went to school. So it doesn't matter how many points you have. It's basically an art as opposed to a science?
 - A That's correct. It's a science -- the science has been proven in the past.
- 10 Q I'm sorry.

6

7

8

- 11 A As far as the science, it has been proven in the past.
- 13 Q How do you prove that no print in mankind matches
 14 any other print in mankind?
- 15 A Through history.
- 16 Q None that you're aware of?
- 17 A Right.
- Q Okay. But as far as the identification of the
 prints, isn't it true that you make that
 identification by looking at points of comparison
 between one print and another print?
- 22 A That's correct.
- 23 Q And that's what you did in this case?
- 24 A That's correct.
- 25 Q And you found seven points of comparison?

For illustrative purposes there's (unintelligible). 1 Α For points of comparison you try to use features of 2 Q the print, don't you, such as points where, say, 3 one ridge branches into two? 4 5 Α That's correct. Or other -- other things that distinguish one print 6 7 from another. That's correct. Α 8 9 And you found seven of those. Q 10 Α For illustrative purposes. There was actually more, but they were more difficult to see on them 11 12 once there were blown up. 13 Q More difficult than this? 14 When they're blown up. Comparisons are actually made with other magnification of glass. 15 So the comparisons are made before they're blown 16 Q 17 up. That's correct. 18 Α 19 Q Thank you. No more questions. 2.0 THE COURT: Mr. Crawford, any questions? MR. CRAWFORD: Yes. Thank you, your Honor. 21 CROSS-EXAMINATION 22 23 BY MR. CRAWFORD: Detective Chapman, you've indicated that you 24 25 received the fingerprint card for Lana Canen on

```
1
            August 29, 2003. Is that correct?
 2
            I believe that is correct.
           And you received that from Joel Bourdon. Is that
 3
        Q
           correct?
 4
          Correct.
                MR. CRAWFORD: No further questions.
 6
 7
                THE COURT: Ms. Becker.
                MS. BECKER: No redirect.
 8
                THE COURT: You may step down. Watch your
 9
10
      step, please. Call your next witness.
                MR. WILLIAMS: State calls Detective Todd
11
12
      Thayer.
13
                MS. BECKER: May this witness be released from
14
      his subpoena?
15
                THE COURT: Mr. Zook, is he released?
16
                MR. ZOOK: Yes.
17
                THE COURT: Mr. Crawford.
18
                MR. CRAWFORD: Yes.
19
                THE COURT: He'll be released. Raise your
20
      right hand, sir.
21
                     (The witness was sworn.)
                THE WITNESS: I do.
22
23
                THE COURT: Take the witness stand.
     1111
24
      ////
25
```

TODD THAYER 1 called on behalf of the State, having been first duly 2 3 sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION 4 5 BY MR. WILLIAMS: Please introduce yourself to the jury? 6 7 Α Todd S. Thayer. And what's your occupation? 0 8 Currently a sergeant with the Elkhart Police 9 Α 10 Department. How long have you been a sergeant with the Elkhart 11 0 12 Police Department. 13 Α About seven months. 14 Q Now, what's your current, I guess, job duties as a sergeant? 15 16 Α I'm a shift-level supervisor for the midnight 17 shift, which is from 11:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. I want to take you back to November 28, 2002. Were 18 0 you a sergeant -- or, I quess, what was your 19 2.0 position back then? I was a detective at that time. 21 Α Were you with any specific part of the police 22 23 department? 24 Α Yes. At that time, I was involved in the homicide 25 investigation.

- Q Now, were you involved in the investigation of Helen Sailor's murder?
- A Yes, I was.
- Q And when were you involved in this investigation?
- A Right at the initial onset. I was called directly to the scene once her body had been discovered.
 - Q At some point during your investigation, did you interview residents at the Waterfall Highrise complex?
- 10 A Yes.

2

3

4

7

8

9

18

19

- Q And during that time, did you have some contact
 with a person by the name of Lana Canen?
- 13 A Yes, I did.
- Q Do you see Lana Canen in the courtroom today?
- 15 A Yes, I do.
- Q Would you point where she's seated and what she's wearing?
 - A She's a white female with long hair with the multicolour blue and yellow top there.
- 20 MR. WILLIAMS: Your Honor, may the record
 21 reflect that the witness has identified the defendant
 22 Lana Canen.
- THE COURT: The record will so reflect.
- 24 BY MR. WILLIAMS:
 - Q Your contact with Ms. Canen, was that in the

initial investigation in the initial part of it?

A Yes.

- Q Where did you make contact with her?
- A In her apartment.
- Q Now, describe that contact with her when you came into contact with her at her apartment?
- A One of our normal procedures on a homicide investigation what we would call a neighborhood canvas. If it was a residential area like a house, we would knock on your door and talk to people if maybe they had potentially seen something. Since it was apartment complex, we were going to each door and each apartment to speak with the residences to see if they might possibly have seen anything that would help our session investigation.
- Q And did you do that with respect to Lana Canen's apartment?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q Describe how you came into contact with Ms. Canen?
 - A Well, we attempted to contact her several times,
 left a business card on her door over the past
 couple of days during the initial part of the
 investigation. We had not received a call from
 her, or I had not received a call from her or had
 not spoke to her so we were at the Highrise when we

- were told by some other residences that she was present at the apartment in her apartment. So at that time, Detective Christian and I proceeded up to her apartment in an attempt to contact her.
- Q What did you do once you got to her apartment?
- A We knocked on her door for several minutes. We could see that there was somebody inside. I could see light moving and shadows underneath the door as if somebody was standing on the other side of the door; however, Ms. Canen wouldn't answer the door.
- Q What did you do?

2.0

- A Well, at that time since we already had one homicide I felt that there might possibly be something wrong with her. Maybe she couldn't speak, she couldn't answer the door. So at that time I called for maintenance, and a maintenance person came with the key. We were able to unlock the door. Once we unlocked the door, we noticed that the chain was engaged. The chain lock was engaged on the door. Once we started to open it, Lana spoke up that she was coming to the door.
- Q Did she come to the door?
- 23 A Yes, she did.
 - Q Did she indicated where she had been?
- 25 A She stated that she was asleep on the sofa which

- was just a couple feet from the door. 1 Now, when she came to the door, did you ask her any 2 3 questions? Yes. 4 Α Q What did you ask her? Just asked her if he was aware that a homicide had 6 7 taken place in the highrise. She stated that she knew there had been a homicide. I asked her if she 8 was familiar with Lana -- or excuse -- Mrs. Sailor, 9 10 the victim. She says she knew her and had contact 11 with her in the past. 12 Did you ask her where she had been at the time of Q 13 the murder? 14 Α Yes, I did. What did she say? 15 0 16 She stated that she was out of town visiting 17 friends and family over the Thanksqiving holiday. MR. ZOOK: Your Honor, may we approach. 18 THE COURT: You may. 19
 - THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to give you a recess. You're all jurors in this case. I must tell you now and I will repeat this again each time you are permitted to separate.

at the bench.)

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

(An off-the-record discussion was held

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

time.

Generally, you should not express any opinion about the case before it is submitted to you for deliberation; however, you are permitted to discuss the evidence presented in this case amongst yourselves in the jury room during recesses from trial. All jurors and alternates must be present during these discussions, and you must reserve judgment about the outcome of the case until your deliberations begin. You are admonished that you may not discuss the facts of the case with anyone other than your fellow jurors. You may not discuss this case with me or with the lawyers, parties or with any of the witnesses. You should not listen to or read any outside or media accounts of the trial. You may not investigate the case or attempt to obtain information outside the courtroom. It is highly improper for you to do so. You are to consider and decide this case only upon the evidence received during the course of the trial in the courtroom. We're going to address a legal issue at this

(The jury and the witness left the courtroom, and the following proceedings were had.)

THE COURT: All right. Be seated. All right.

The record in this action at this time reflects the witness stated that he tried to contact Ms. Canen several times, left a card, learned from other persons that she was at her apartment on the day in question, knocked on her door, could see shadows in the light and movement inside. The witness has testified that he was concerned for the well-being, essentially that's what he said. He was concerned for the well-being in light of the fact there had been had a homicide at the highrise building, and he didn't want to be in a situation where he was facing with another one. I assume that's what he was talking about, although he didn't say it in those words.

2.0

2.5

He then stated that he got maintenance to open the door. When maintenance opened the door, the chain was across the lock and the door jam. Then he said Ms. Canen came to the door and opened it. He asked her if she knew of the death. She stated she did know of the death. Asked if she knew Ms. Sailor, and she said she did. At that point, Mr. Zook, I guess, formally did not make an objection but raised the issue.

MR. ZOOK: I objected, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. What is your objection? Tell me specifically.

MR. ZOOK: My objection, your Honor, is that the -- the police at this point have broken into her

```
apartment. She was not free to leave. They've confirmed
 1
      that she's okay. The questioning did not have anything
      to do with whether Ms. Canen was all right or not. It
 3
      had to do with an interrogation regarding the facts of
 4
      this case and regarding Ms. Sailor.
                At that point, she should have been read her
 6
 7
      rights and told that she did not need to communicate with
      them about that. She obviously was a suspect if they
 8
      were asking her about what she was doing on the night
 9
10
      that the murder happened. I think that it's obvious what
      happened, and perhaps they were concerned for her safety.
11
12
      But looking at it from her subjective angle, she would
13
      not feel free to leave.
                THE COURT: She would not feel free to leave
14
      her own apartment where this occurred.
15
16
                MR. ZOOK: Right. Not after they come in.
17
                THE COURT: So you're saying there was
      custodial interrogation I guess.
18
19
                MR. ZOOK: Right.
2.0
                THE COURT: And she is in her own apartment.
      She doesn't come to the door. Testimony so far is that
21
      she opened the door and let them in, is it not?
22
23
                MR. ZOOK: Well, she didn't open the door.
24
                THE COURT: She took the chain off the door.
```

MR. ZOOK: Right. She saw they were coming in

anyway.

2.0

2.5

THE COURT: All right. Anything else you want to tell me about this.

MR. ZOOK: No, sir.

THE COURT: Ms. Becker or Mr. Williams, your response to Mr. Zook's I guess what you would call it an oral motion to suppress.

MR. ZOOK: Right.

MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, there was no custody in this case in this particular circumstance. They were there to speak with Ms. Canen regarding what she may have known in the normal canvassing as they did with many other residents. It was a welfare check. As the officer stated, he was concerned potentially for her safety. She came to the door. She's the one that unlocked the chain, or at least the indication from the officer was that the door was open, but it was still chained shut. She was in her own apartment. There's no evidence that she didn't feel free to leave before this court.

THE COURT: Ms. Jackson, would you ask Sergeant Thayer to come back in. I want to hear what he has to say. Why don't you put on the full and complete version of your testimony that you're anticipating here, and let's see where we go with that. The record should reflect the jury is not present in the courtroom at this

time. Sergeant Thayer, take the witness stand again if 1 2 you would, please. 3 MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, just so I'm clear the full and complete testimony as far as up to what he's 4 5 already stated. THE COURT: You don't have to do that again. 6 7 Pick it up with he asked if she knew of the death of Ms. Sailor. She said she did knew -- she did know about 8 it, and Ms. Canen said she knew Ms. Sailor. Pick it up 9 10 there. BY MR. WILLIAMS: 11 12 Did you ask Ms. Canen where she was on the date of 13 Helen Sailor's murder November 28, 2002? 14 Α Yes. What was her response? 15 0 16 A She stated she was out of town visiting friends or 17 relatives over the Thanksqiving holiday. MR. WILLIAMS: That is the extent of testimony. 18 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Zook, that's the 19 20 extent of the testimony. How is that a problem you? 21 MR. ZOOK: It's -- it's simply an interrogation where she wasn't given the appropriate warnings. 22 23 THE COURT: Do you have any questions you'd 24 like to ask the sergeant? MR. ZOOK: Due to the limited nature of the 25

```
1
      testimony, I have no questions.
                THE COURT: You have no questions. Anybody
 2
 3
      have anything else they want to submit on the matter?
                MR. WILLIAMS: Well, Judge, I would also
 4
      indicate --
 5
                THE COURT: Evidence wise.
 6
 7
                MR. WILLIAMS: I'm sorry. No.
                THE COURT: You have to go back out in the
 8
      hall.
 9
10
                     (The witness exited the courtroom.)
                THE COURT: All right. So far there is no
11
12
      evidence Canen was in custody or arrested. There is no
13
      evidence before me to indicate her side of the story with
14
      respect to Ms. Canen's state of mind. In fact, Ms. Canen
      has offered no evidence to support her position.
15
                When a defendant challenges the admissibility
16
      of evidence claiming it was illegal to be obtained, he or
17
      she has the burden of going forward with evidence in
18
19
      support of that challenge. Failure to do so should
2.0
      result in the rejection of the challenge. Timberlake
21
      versus State 690 N.E.2d 243, a 1997 case. Simpson versus
      State 506 N.E.2d 473, a 1987 case.
22
23
                If the defendant produces evidence to support
24
      their challenge, the burden then shifts to the state. At
      this point, we have no evidence from the defendant in
2.5
```

```
1
      support of her position other than the assertions of her
      counsel. The assertions of her counsel are not evidence.
 2
 3
      I would also note that the question was already answered
      by the witness precisely the same as he answered it here
 4
      out of the jury's presence when the jury was present in
 5
      the courtroom before the objection was made. Your
 6
 7
      objection is overruled. Anybody have anything else they
      want to say on that issue?
 8
                MR. ZOOK: No, sir.
 9
10
                MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor.
                     (The jury entered the courtroom, and
11
12
                     the following proceedings were had.)
13
                THE COURT: Be seated. Mr. Williams.
14
                    DIRECT EXAMINATION CONTINUED
      BY MR. WILLIAMS:
15
16
            Detective Thayer, we were talking about a
17
            conversation you were having with Ms. Canen at her
            door.
18
19
        Α
            Yes.
2.0
        Q
            My question to you is did you ask Lana Canen where
            she had been at the time of Helen Sailor's murder
21
            on November 28, 2002?
22
23
                MR. ZOOK: Same objection, your Honor.
24
                THE COURT: The objection will be overruled for
      the reasons previously stated by the Court.
2.5
```

```
1
      BY MR. WILLIAMS:
            And what did Lana Canen say?
 2
            She stated she was out of town with friends and
 3
            family over the Thanksgiving holiday.
 4
                MR. WILLIAMS: No further questions, your
 5
      Honor.
 6
 7
                THE COURT: Mr. Zook, any cross-examination?
                          CROSS-EXAMINATION
 8
      BY MR. ZOOK:
 9
10
          Detective Thayer, you were present with one other
11
            person.
12
        Α
          Yes.
13
            You were present with what other person?
          Detective Christian.
14
            Okay. And did Detective Christian go ahead and
15
        0
16
            search the apartment?
17
        Α
           No, not that I recall.
            Wasn't -- wasn't permission requested and didn't
18
        Q
            Detective Christian qo ahead and search after --
19
2.0
                THE COURT: Okay. You have two questions.
      Let's do one at the time.
21
                THE WITNESS: Not that I recall.
22
23
            Not that you recall. Could that have happened?
24
        Α
          Yes.
                MR. ZOOK: Okay. No more questions.
25
```

THE COURT: Mr. Crawford, any questions? 1 2 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, your Honor. Thank you. 3 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ZOOK: 4 5 Detective Thayer, you've indicated that you were involved in the initial investigation of the 6 7 homicide in this case. Is that correct? Yes, sir. Α 8 And that as part of your duties with that job you 9 Q 10 interviewed a number of residents at the highrise. Is that correct? 11 12 That is correct. Α 13 Q And I believe you also testified that you went into 14Lana Canen's apartment. Is that correct? Yes. 15 Α 16 Did you go into any other residents' apartments during your investigation? 17 18 Α Yes. Were the apartment basically laid out the same, if 19 Q 2.0 you remember? As far as I recall, yes? 21 Α THE COURT: Excuse me. Keep in mind that 22 23 whatever conversation you're having at that table is 24 being amplified through the courtroom. 25 MR. ZOOK: Yes, Judge.

1		THE COURT: Go ahead.	
2	BY MR. CRAWFORD:		
3	Q	So they were similar style apartments. Is that	
4		correct?	
5	А	Yes.	
6	Q	Do you recall or estimate how many people you	
7		talked to at the highrise concerning the death of	
8		Helen Sailor?	
9	A	A couple dozen.	
10	Q	And did you gather a lot of different information	
11		from these people?	
12	A	Yes.	
13	Q	And over the course of how long a period of time	
14		was it that you were involved in doing this	
15		investigation?	
16	А	Total or during my neighborhood canvas?	
17	Q	Your neighborhood canvas?	
18	А	Approximately five days.	
19	Q	And how long total were you involved in this	
20		process?	
21	A	Well, it was an ongoing investigation up to the	
22		point where I left working homicide, so several	
23		months.	
24	Q	You mention that it was initially five days is when	
25		you spoke to the people at the highrise. Is that	

652 STATE'S WITNESS - TODD THAYER - (REDIRECT) 1 correct? 2 Α Yes. Q Did there also come periods of time after that you went back and spoke to people at the highrise? 4 5 Α Yes. 6 0 And that -- did that occur over the seven months? 7 Α Yes. 8 MR. CRAWFORD: No, other questions. THE COURT: Mr. Williams, any other questions? 9 10 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 11 BY MR. WILLIAMS: During, your initial canvas and the questioning 12 that you did with different people over those five 13 14days, were you questions related to where they had been, what they were doing? 15 16 Yes. Α 17 0 Did you disclose to any of these people the specifics or the details of the homicide --18 19 No, sir. Α -- while you were talking to them? 20 Q 21 Α No. Thank you. 22 Q 23 MR. WILLIAMS: No further questions, your 24 Honor. MR. ZOOK: No questions. 25

```
STATE'S WITNESS - TODD THAYER - (RECROSS)
 1
                MR. CRAWFORD: Just briefly, your Honor.
                         RECROSS-EXAMINATION
 2
 3
      BY MR. CRAWFORD:
            And you did testify that you learned a various
 4
            amount of information from all the people you
 6
            talked to. Is that correct?
 7
           Yes, sir.
        0
           Thank you.
 8
                THE COURT: Anybody else have any questions for
 9
      this witness?
10
11
                MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor.
                THE COURT: You may step down. Is he excused,
12
      counsel?
13
14
                MR. ZOOK: Yes.
                MR. CRAWFORD: Yes.
15
                THE COURT: He'll be excused. Counsel
16
17
      approach, please.
                     (An off-the-record discussion was held
18
19
                     at the bench.)
                THE COURT: Call your next witness.
20
                MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, your Honor.
21
      state calls Judy Johnson.
22
23
                THE COURT: Raise your right hand if you would,
24
      please.
25
                     (The witness was sworn.)
```

1		THE WITNESS: I do.	
2		THE COURT: Take the witness stand, please.	
3		JUDY JOHNSTON	
4	calle	d on behalf of the State, having been first duly	
5	sworn	, testified as follows:	
6		DIRECT EXAMINATION	
7	BY MR. WILLIAMS:		
8	Q	Could you introduce yourself to the jury?	
9	A	I'm Judy Johnston. I'm from Elkhart.	
10	Q	Ms. Johnston, could you spell your last name for	
11		the record?	
12	A	J-o-h-n-s-t-o-n.	
13	Q	And what is your occupation?	
14	A	I'm a teacher.	
15	Q	Where are you a teacher at?	
16	A	Eastwood Elementary School in Elkhart.	
17	Q	What grade do you teach?	
18	A	I'm a phys ed teacher so it's kindergarten through	
19		sixth grade.	
20	Q	All right. How long have you been teaching there?	
21	A	Seventeen years.	
22	Q	Do you know a person by the name of Lana Canen?	
23	A	Yes, I do.	
24	Q	How do you know her?	
25	A	I was at Krogers in Elkhart late one night in the	

summer of 2002, and she was in line. We were both 1 in line to check out. And when I went out to my 2 3 car I noticed that she was walking down the street carrying some bags, and it was late at night, and I 4 just felt I should offer her a ride, and so she accepted the offer and just kind of started talking 6 7 together, and asked her if she knew about the Lord, and we started talking about sharing my faith and 8 so forth with her and kind of struck up a 9 10 friendship. 11 Now, do you see Lana Canen in the room today? 12 Α Yes, I do. 13 Q Can you point out where she's seated, and what 14 she's wearing? A plaid suit it looks as if. 15 16 And is she sitting to your left in the courtroom? 17 Α Yes, to the far left. MR. WILLIAMS: Your Honor, may the record 18 reflect the witness has identified the defendant Lana 19 2.0 Canen? 21 THE COURT: The record will so reflect. MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, your Honor. 22 23 BY MR. WILLIAMS: 24 You struck up a conversation with Ms. Canen in you 25 your car as you were leaving or going home from

Krogers. Did you develop a friendship with her? 1 Yes, we did. Yes, I did. 2 Α 3 Q Would you do things with her? I would -- she did not have a car -- a vehicle at 4 А the time. So I would take her to maybe pick up 5 prescriptions or medications or to run errands. 6 7 Several times she went to church with me and to a like a Bible study class. 8 9 Over what period of time was this? You said summer Q 10 of 2002 you met her --11 Α Probably over the next several months. I think 12 probably through October. 13 Q Was -- what happened in October? 14I would stop by where she was living like on Sunday mornings to stop and ring the buzzer to see if 15 16 she'd, like, want to go to church and so forth, and 17 she just either was not there or would not answer. So there really was no way to get ahold of her, and 18 she had my name and number knew she was free to 19 20 call if she needed something, and I just did not hear from her. 21 22 So there was a period of time which you basically 23 lost contact with Ms. Canen. How long did that 24 last? 25 Probably from October of 2002 to about the next --

STATE'S WITNESS - JUDY JOHNSTON - (CROSS) 1 probably about the next year. So for about a year you didn't have any contact 2 with Ms. Canen. When you, I guess, established contact with Ms. Canen again in October of 2003, 4 did you ever have a conversation with her about 6 Helen Sailor's murder? 7 Yes. Α 8 Did Lana Canen tell you where she was at the time of Helen Sailor's murder? 9 Yes. 10 Α What did she say? 11 Q She told me that she was out of town. 12 Did Lana Canen ever tell you where -- if she'd ever 13 0 14 been in Helen Sailor's apartment? Yes. She denied that she had ever been in the 15 Α apartment. 16 17 MR. WILLIAMS: No further questions, your 18 Honor. 19 THE COURT: Mr. Zook. 20 CROSS-EXAMINATION 21 BY MR. ZOOK: Did you put Lana under oath before your asked her? 22 23 Α Excuse me? 24 Q Did Lana -- was Lana under oath when she told you those things like you are now? 25

```
STATE'S WITNESS - JUDY JOHNSTON - (CROSS)
 1
            No. It was a private conversation.
                MR. ZOOK: Okay. No more questions.
 2
 3
                THE COURT: Mr. Crawford, any questions?
                MR. CRAWFORD: No questions, your Honor.
 4
                THE COURT: Mr. Williams, any additional
 5
 6
      questions?
 7
                MR. WILLIAMS: No further questions, your
 8
      Honor.
 9
                THE COURT: You may step down. Watch your
      step, please. Is she released from her subpoena?
10
11
                MS. BECKER: Yes.
12
                MR. CRAWFORD: Yes.
                MR. ZOOK: Yes.
13
14
                THE COURT: She'll be released from her
      subpoena. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to break for
15
16
      lunch at this time, and it is your lucky day because
17
      we're going to give you two-hour lunch today. I'd like
      you back at 1:45 in the jury room. We'll try to get back
18
19
      in the courtroom at two o'clock.
20
                Before you go to lunch, I need to remind you.
21
      You are all jurors in this case. I must tell you now and
      I will repeat this again each time you are permitted to
22
23
      separate.
24
                Generally, you should not express any opinion
      about the case before it is submitted to you for
25
```

deliberation; however, you are permitted to discuss the evidence presented in this case amongst yourselves in the jury room during recesses from trial. All jurors and alternates must be present during these discussions, and you must reserve judgment about the outcome of the case until your deliberations begin.

2.0

2.5

You are admonished that you may not discuss the facts of the case with anyone other than your fellow jurors.

You may not discuss this case with me or with the lawyers, parties or with any of the witnesses.

You should not listen to or read any outside or media accounts of the trial. You may not investigate the case or attempt to obtain information outside the courtroom. It is highly improper for you to do so. You are to consider and decide this case only upon the evidence received during the course of the trial in the courtroom. Have a good lunch. 1:45 in the jury room.

See you back here at two.

(The jury left the courtroom, and the following proceedings were had.)

THE COURT: Counsel for the defendants are present, counsel for the state is present, both defendants are present. In light of the testimony of the last witness it would appear this has a distinct bearing

```
on the testimony of Sergeant Thayer. The precise
 1
      testimony Sergeant Thayer gave with respect to Ms. Canen
 2
      being out of the area visiting family members is the same
 3
      testimony this lay witness gave. In that sense, it would
 4
      appear to be cumulative of other evidence and harmless
 5
      error if any error at all.
 6
 7
                I gave you copies of the Court' final
      instruction a preliminary version. Is anyone having any
 8
      problems with them so far?
 9
10
                MS. BECKER: So far no, but I have not looked
11
      at them yet.
12
                MR. CRAWFORD: I haven't looked at them yet
13
      either.
                THE COURT: Juror Ms. Oakley has indicated to
14
      the bailiff that she is personally acquainted with Judy
15
      Johnston. She's made that disclosure. Is she still
16
17
      here? Bring her in.
18
                     (The juror entered the courtroom.)
                THE COURT: And if you would raise your right
19
20
      hand, please.
21
                     (The juror was sworn.)
                A JUROR: I do.
22
23
                THE COURT: Tell me your name Karen Oakley.
                A JUROR: Karen Oakley.
24
25
                THE COURT: Ms. Oakley, you've made a
```

```
disclosure to the bailiff. You indicated to the bailiff
 1
      you were personally acquainted with Judy Johnston the
 2
      last witness who has testified here today. Is that
 3
      correct?
                A JUROR: Correct.
                THE COURT: All right. The fact that you are
 6
 7
      personally acquainted with this witness, will that make
      any difference in your deliberations one way or the
 8
      other?
 9
10
                A JUROR: No, sir.
                THE COURT: Does it have anything to do with
11
12
      the evidence that has been presented here?
13
                A JUROR: No, sir.
                THE COURT: Are you telling me you'll make your
14
      decision based upon the evidence that's been presented
15
      and not on your acquaintance with the witness?
16
17
                A JUROR: Yes, sir.
                THE COURT: Ms. Becker or Ms. Williams, any
18
      question for Ms. Oakley?
19
2.0
                MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor.
                THE COURT: Mr. Zook, any questions?
21
                MR. ZOOK: No, your Honor.
22
23
                THE COURT: And Mr. Crawford, any questions?
24
                MR. CRAWFORD: None, your Honor.
                THE COURT: Thank you very much. You may go to
25
```

```
lunch.
 1
                The record should reflect that both defendants
 2
 3
      were present when Ms. Oakley was questioned. Mr. Zook,
      any objections to Ms. Oakley continuing as a juror?
 4
                MR. ZOOK: No, sir.
                THE COURT: And Mr. Crawford.
 6
 7
                MR. CRAWFORD: No, your Honor.
                THE COURT: And Ms. Becker.
 8
                MS. BECKER: No, your Honor.
 9
10
                THE COURT: She'll continue as a juror, and you
      should so inform her.
11
12
                     (A recess was taken for lunch.)
13
                     (The Court convened with all the
14
                     parties present. The jury entered the
15
                     courtroom and the following
16
                     proceedings were had.)
                THE COURT: Be seated, please. State call your
17
      next witness.
18
                MR. WILLIAMS: State calls Lieutenant Peggy
19
2.0
      Snider.
21
                THE COURT: Raise your right hand, please.
                     (The witness was sworn.)
22
23
                THE WITNESS: I do.
24
                THE COURT: Take the witness stand, please.
      1111
25
```

1		PEGGY SNIDER	
2	called on behalf of the State, having been first duly		
3	sworn	, testified as follows:	
4		DIRECT EXAMINATION	
5	BY MS. BECKER:		
6	Q	Would you introduce yourself to our jury?	
7	A	Peggy Snider.	
8	Q	And, Ms. Snider, what's your occupation?	
9	A	I'm a detective detective bureau with the	
10		Elkhart Police Department.	
11	Q	How long have you been a detective with the Elkhart	
12		Police Department?	
13	A	Approximately 17 years.	
14	Q	What's your current position with the Elkhart	
15		Police Department?	
16	A	I'm a lieutenant in the adult division of the	
17		detective bureau.	
18	Q	Now, I want to take you back to November 28 of	
19		2002. What was your position with the Elkhart	
20		Police Department on that day?	
21	A	That was a Friday I believe. I was a lieutenant in	
22		the detective bureau.	
23	Q	So as of Thanksgiving of 2002, you were a detective	
24		in the bureau, the detective bureau?	
25	A	Yes, I was.	

- Q What were your responsibilities in detective bureau at that time?
 - A Supervise the detectives, manage cases that came in and what other Detectives were investigating.
- 5 Q Now, are you familiar with the intersection of Oslo 6 Road and Bristol Street?
- 7 A Yes, I am.

4

- Q And what city is that in?
- 9 A City of Elkhart.
- 10 Q And how far away is that insection from the
 11 Waterfall Highrise Apartment Complex?
- 12 A I would say two to two and a half mile.
- Q Were you involved in the investigation of Helen
 Sailor's murder?
- 15 A Yes, I was.
- 16 Q When were you involved in that investigation?
- 17 A The day the -- the day the homicide occurred, which
 18 was the day after Thanksgiving 2002 I believe.
- 19 Q And did your involvement last throughout the 20 investigation?
- 21 A Basically, yes.
- Q Did there come a time in August of 2003 that the
 Elkhart Police Department developed a homicide
- 24 unit?
- 25 A Yes, there was.

665 And were you a part of the homicide unit? 1 0 Yes, I was. 2 Α 3 Q At some point in your investigation, did you have contact with a Lana Canen? 4 5 Α Yes, I did. When was that? 6 0 7 I believe that was September 2, 2003. Α Do you see Lana Canen in the courtroom today? 0 8 Yes, I do. 9 Α 10 0 Can you point out where she's seated, and what's she's wearing? 11 12 She's at seated at the far end of the defense table Α 13 wearing a blue plaid jacket and has long dark hair. 14 MR. WILLIAMS: May the record reflect that the witness has identified the defendant Lana Canen. 15 THE COURT: The record will so reflect. 16 17 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, your Honor. BY MR. WILLIAMS: 18 Why was it that you had contact with Lana Canen on 19 2.0 September 2, 2003? Α We had -- during the course of the investigation, 21 had discovered a fingerprint that belonged to her 22 23 that was inside the apartment of the deceased. 24 0 When you say the deceased, that's Helen Sailor?

25

А

Yes, sir.

- Q At some point on September 2, did you pick Lana
 Canen up?

 A Yes, I did.
- 4 Q Where did you take her?

- 5 A To the Elkhart Police Department.
- Q And what did you do once you got there with Lana
 Canen?
 - A She was taken to an interview room.
- 9 Q Was anybody else working with you at that time?
- 10 A Yes, there were several of us: Sergeant Wargo and I
 11 believe Detective Conway and Detective Daggy.
- 12 Q Specifically after you had taken her to the interview what happened?
- A Sergeant Wargo went into the interview room and began talking with her.
- 16 Q Now, where did you go?
- 17 A Into another room that we have video capability of
 18 observing the -- in some of the interviews of the
 19 police department.
- 20 Q Did you observe the interview with Lana Canen?
- 21 A Yes, I did.
- Q Now, was Lana Canen Mirandised before Sergeant
 Wargo talked to her?
- 24 A He -- he Mirandised her.
- 25 Q And did Lana Canen indicate that she understood her

Miranda Rights? 1 Yes, she did. 2 Α 3 Q Did she agree to waive those rights? Yes, she did. 4 Α 5 Did she agree to talk to Sergeant Wargo? Yes, she did. 6 Α 7 Now, you said that this room had video capability. Q Was this interview videotaped? 8 No, sir, it was not. 9 Α 10 Q And why wasn't it videotaped? It was just a preliminary interview with Lana, and 11 12 it was not our policy or procedure at that time to 13 interview -- I'm sorry -- to videotape the initial 14 interviews. So this preinterview was not videotaped or 15 16 audiotaped? 17 Α No, sir. Can you describe the interview process that 18 Sergeant Wargo went through as far as did he 19 2.0 complete the entire interview? Α I don't recall if I watched the entire interview. 21 I know I started watching it, and I may have been 22 23 interrupted and didn't watch the complete 24 interview, but at one point in time he ended the interview with her and asked, I believe, if I would 25

go in and talk with her. Well, I think maybe I 1 might have went in and offered her some water or 2 something to drink, and I began talking with her at 3 that time. 4 5 So you to took over the -- the interview process. Q Yes, I did. 6 Α 7 Was Sergeant Wargo in the room with you when you Q took that interview process over? 8 No, he was not. 9 Α 10 0 Can you tell the jury what you talked to Lana Canen about when you started with the interview process? 11 12 I asked her -- and I had a rapport with Lana so she Α 13 knew me. I'd asked her if she'd ever been into 14 Helen's room into her --MR. ZOOK: Your Honor, may I voir dire? 15 16 THE COURT: You may. 17 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION BY MR. ZOOK: 18 Peggy, I believe you said that you had -- you 19 2.0 talked with Lana after Sergeant Wargo. Is that right? 21 Yes, sir. 22 23 And Sergeant Wargo Mirandised her. 24 Α Yes. 25 Was there a sheet of paper that Lana signed saying

1 that she'd received the warnings? I believe so, but I'm not certain. 2 3 Q Isn't it department procedure that you would get her signature on a piece of paper? 4 Normally it is, but sometimes they -- they will 5 Α agree to talk with us, but they do not want to sign 6 7 anything. Is that what happened in her case? 0 8 I don't recall. 9 Д 10 0 And it's also procedure that you don't video or audiotape these meetings. 11 12 Α The initial -- the initial interview with subjects, 13 no, not necessarily. At that time, it was not. 14 MR. ZOOK: That's all. 15 THE COURT: Mr. Williams. 16 DIRECT EXAMINATION CONTINUED BY MR. WILLIAMS: 17 Detective Snider, any doubt that Lana Canen was 18 Mirandised before she was spoken to on September 2, 19 2.0 2003? No, sir. 21 Α Let's go back to when you began your interview 22 23 process with Ms. Canen. Tell the jury what you 24 talked to Lana Canen about? I began talking with her asking her about Helen and 2.5

- if she'd ever been into Helen's apartment, and she said she had not. Obviously, I knew that she had been because of the evidence that we had, and I tried to get her to tell me that she had been into Helen's apartment, but she was adamant that she had never been inside Helen's apartment.
- Q After she denied being in Helen's apartment, what did you talk about?
- A I talked to her about a fingerprint and that if the possibility existed of us having a fingerprint of her's inside of Helen's apartment how that could be. She still denied ever being in Helen's apartment.
- Q So you floated it out there that if you had a print how would it have gotten there.
- A Yes.

- Q And she again indicated that she'd never been in the apartment.
- 19 A Correct.
 - Q What else did you talk about?
 - A Obviously, she didn't -- I don't know if she didn't think that we had a fingerprint, if I was just lying to her; and then I told her specifically I told her, "Lana we do have a fingerprint, it is your fingerprint, and it was in Helen's apartment."

- Q Did she ask where the fingerprint was found?
- 2 A Yes, she did.

3

8

9

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q And what did she ask you?
- A I told her, I said, "I won't be specific as to

 where the fingerprint was found, but all I will

 tell you it had something to do with Helen's

 medication."
 - Q So she asked where it was, and you told her it had something to do with the medication.
- 10 A Correct.
- 11 Q You weren't specific?
- 12 A No, sir.
- Q What was her response after you told her that it had something to do with the medication?
 - A She said that if it had anything to do with the medication that it would have to be more than one because she's opened up hundreds of pill bottles in her lifetime, and she knows -- and she demonstrated how she would open it and that her fingerprints would be on the bottle not just a fingerprint.
 - Q So when you said that there'd have to be more than one, what were you referring to?
- 23 A I'm sorry.
- Q You said there would have -- that Lana had said
 that there would have to be more than one if she'd

opened a pill bottle. What's the one that you are 1 2 referring to? 3 Α I told her, I said, "I didn't tell you where the fingerprint was. I just said we had a fingerprint 4 and it had something to do with the medication. 5 did not indicate that it was on a pill bottle." 6 7 And you indicated that it was a single fingerprint. Q Yes, I did. Α 8 9 Q Then she demonstrated how she would open up a pill 10 bottle. 11 Correct. 12 Q And indicated that if that was the case because the 13 way she opens up pill bottles there would have to 14 be more than one fingerprint. That is correct. 15 Α 16 You followed that up with saying that I never said Q it was on a pill bottle. 17 Correct. 18 Α Did Lana say that she had been in Helen's 19 Q 2.0 apartment? She continued denying ever being in Helen's 21 Α 22 apartment. 23 MR. WILLIAMS: Nothing further, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Mr. Zook. 25 MR. ZOOK: No questions.

THE COURT: Mr. Crawford.

MR. CRAWFORD: No questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: You may step down. Watch your step, please. Call your next witness, or do we need a recess before the next witness? Ladies and gentlemen we're going to take a recess. We're going to address a legal issue at this time outside of your presence.

You are all jurors in this case. I must tell you now and I will repeat this again each time you are permitted to separate.

Generally, you should not express any opinion about the case before it is submitted to you for deliberation; however, you are permitted to discuss the evidence presented in this case amongst yourselves in the jury room during recesses from trial. All jurors and alternates must be present during these discussions, and you must reserve judgment about the outcome of the case until your deliberations begin.

You are admonished that you may not discuss the facts of the case with anyone other than your fellow jurors.

You may not discuss this case with me or with the lawyers, parties or with any of the witnesses.

You should not listen to or read any outside or media accounts of the trial. You may not investigate the

```
case or attempt to obtain information outside the
 1
                  It is highly improper for you to do so. You
 2
      courtroom.
      are to consider and decide this case only upon the
 3
      evidence received during the course of the trial in the
 4
      courtroom. We're going to take with a recess at this
 5
      time. It will be of unknown length.
 6
 7
                     (The jury left the courtroom, and the
                     following proceedings were had.)
 8
                THE COURT: Mr. Williams has indicated there is
 9
10
      a need to hear some testimony outside of the jury's
      presence to be sure that we do not create any Bruton Rule
11
12
      issues. Bring your witness. Raise your right hand.
13
                     (The witness was sworn.)
14
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
                THE COURT: Take the witness stand, please.
15
      Mr. Williams, we're going to hear this testimony that
16
17
      you're wanting to offer?
18
                MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, your Honor.
19
                THE COURT: Go ahead.
2.0
                             NINA PORTER
      called on behalf of the State, having been first duly
21
      sworn, testified as follows:
22
23
                         DIRECT EXAMINATION
24
      BY MR. WILLIAMS:
25
            Ms. Porter, I want to talk to you about --
```

```
THE COURT: Let's start off with her name.
 1
      BY MR. WILLIAMS:
 2
 3
        Q
            I'm sorry. Would you say your name for the record,
            please?
 4
 5
            Nina Porter.
            Ms. Porter, I want to talk to you about some
 6
 7
            different areas so that the judge can make a
            decision on your testimony. I want to specifically
 8
            start with talking about Lana and Andy, Lana Canen
 9
10
            and Andy Royer and their relationship. Do you
            know -- do you know Lana Canen?
11
12
            Yes, I do.
        Α
13
        Q
            And do you know Andy Royer?
14
        Α
            Yes, I do.
            And when did you first meet Lana Canen?
15
        0
16
        Α
            April of 2003.
17
            And when did you first meet Andrew Royer?
            April of 2003.
18
        Α
            When you met them, did you ever see them together?
19
        Q
20
        Α
            Yes.
            How often?
21
        Q
22
        Α
            Very often.
23
            Did you ever see Lana have any control over Andy?
24
        Α
            Yes.
25
        Q
            And can you give us some examples of that?
```

- A If she told him to do something, he'd to do it for her.
 - Q Anything specifically? When you say her, who are you referring to?
- 5 A Lana.

4

- Q So when Lana would tell Andy to do certain things,
 he would do them.
- 8 A Yes.
- 9 Q Can you give us some examples?
- 10 A If he told her -- she told him to go outside he would.
- Q And you could speak up because it's recording, and so that the other counsel can hear. You said that if -- if Lana had told Andy to go outside he would.
 - A Yes.

15

- Q Do you remember any specific incidences of that?
- A One time it was raining outside. She told him to go outside and wait, and he did.
- 19 Q How long did he stay outside?
- 20 A He was still outside when I went back upstairs
 21 probably almost a half an hour.
- 22 Q And was he covered by anything?
- 23 A No. He was all the way outside.
- 24 O So he was out in the rain with no cover.
- 25 A Yes.

- 1 Q For about a half hour.
- 2 A Yes.
- 3 Q Any other times that you saw Lana tell Andy Royer
- 4 to do something and he did it?
- 5 A He did -- if she asked him to turn around, he'd
- 6 turn around.
- 7 Q Anything else?
- 8 A No.
- 9 Q So Lana would just say, "Andy turn around," and
- 10 he'd do it.
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q Now, did you ever see Lana Canen with any drugs?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 Q What kind?
- 15 A Prescription pills.
- Q What type of prescription pills?
- 17 A Zanex, Valium.
- 18 Q Now, how did you know that she had -- that these
- 19 were prescriptions?
- 20 A I seen prescription bottles.
- 21 Q Do you know if they had her name on them?
- 22 A No, I don't know.
- 23 Q So she had prescription bottles, and you saw that
- 24 they were Zanex and Valium.
- 25 A I heard that they were Zanex and Valium.

- 1 Q From who?
 2 A Lana.
- Q So Lana told you that she had prescriptions for Zanex and Valium.
- 5 A Yes.
- 6 Q How did she keep the pills?
- 7 A They were in their bottles in a bag.
- 8 Q What type of bag?
- 9 A Drawstring bag.
- 10 Q Was it a see through drawstring bag?
- 11 A No.
- Q So she had some type of a drawstring bag, and you had seen a couple bottles in this bag before.
- 14 A Yes.
- 15 Q How many pill bottles?
- 16 A Several.
- Q Several. Again, if you could just speak up so that counsel can hear. I know. Are you nervous?
- 19 A Yes.
- Q That's okay. Did Lana ever tell you what she did
 with the pills?
- 22 A She traded them for pot.
- 23 Q She told you this?
- 24 A Yes.
- Q Did she say that she ever traded them for anything

1 else? 2 Money to my roommate. 3 Q To your roommate. Describe what you're talking about that she traded pills to your roommate for 4 money? 5 Α Yes. 6 7 What type of pills? Q Zanex and Valium. Α 8 THE COURT: You're going to have to speak up a 9 10 lot louder. Just yell into the microphone. 11 12 THE COURT: What did she trade it for? 13 Α Money. Now, did Lana ever ask you for money. 14 Q 15 Α Yes. How often? 16 Q 17 Α Often. How long after meeting Lana in -- was it April of 18 Q 2003 --19 20 Α Yes. -- did she start asking for money? 21 Q Probably a week. 22 Α 23 Q So within a week of you meeting her, she started to 24 asking for money. 25 Α Yes.

- 680 Did you give her the money? 1 0 2 Α Yes. 3 Q Was there ever a time when she asked for money that you said no? 4 5 Α Yes. And when you said no to her, what was her demeanor? 6 Q 7 She would get upset. Α Anything else other than being upset? 8 0 9 A Angry. 10 Q So she'd get upset and angry if you said no? 11 Α Yes. 12 Q Was there instances where you just didn't have the 13 money? 14 Α Yes. Or where you had the money and just didn't want to 15 0 16 give it to her? 17 Α I didn't have the money. Did Lana ever request money from you in the 18 Q presence of Andy Royer? 19 20 Α Yes. Did there ever come a time when that occurred when 21 Q 22 you were at Lana's apartment?
- 23 A Yes.
- Q Describe for the Judge what happened.
- 25 A Lana asked me for money, and I told her I didn't

have any money, and she asked me a couple times. I 1 told her I didn't have it, and she asked Andy was I 2 3 a good candidate. So Andrew Royer was present. 4 Q 5 Α Yes. And after you said no a number of times, she asked 6 Q 7 Andy if you were a good candidate. Α Yes. 8 What was Andy's response? 9 Q 10 Α He just put his head down, just kind of shook his 11 head. 12 Did he say anything? 13 Α No. But he shook his head. 14 15 Α Yes. 16 Q Did there ever come a time where Lana asked for 17 money when you were in your apartment? 18 Α Yes. 19 Was Andrew Royer present? Q 20 Α He was outside of my door. Describe for the judge what being outside the door 21 Q what that means? 22 23 We have a stairway between all four apartments, and Lana came in. My door was open because it was 24 summer time. Andy was still outside of the door. 25

```
She asked me for money, and I didn't have it. We
 1
            were still talking, and then Andy stepped in.
 2
            So Lana had asked you for money, you said no, and
 3
        Q
            then after you said no Andrew Royer walked in.
 4
            He stepped into the area we were at.
        Α
            How close did he get?
 6
           Not real close.
 7
        Α
           How did you feel?
        0
 8
            I was intimidated because Andy's a big guy. He
 9
        Α
10
            doesn't talk.
                MR. WILLIAMS: I don't have anything else,
11
12
      Judge.
13
                THE COURT: Mr. Zook, any questions for this
      witness relative to this matter?
14
15
                MR. ZOOK: No.
16
                THE COURT: And again --
17
                MS. BECKER: May we approach.
                THE COURT: I'm trying to find what the legal
18
      issues are here rather than your normal
19
2.0
      cross-examination. That's what I'm asking.
                MR. ZOOK: I understand.
21
                THE COURT: Do you have any questions you want
22
23
      to ask about legal issues that have been presented?
24
                MR. ZOOK: Yes.
                MS. BECKER: I want to bring something to the
25
```

```
1
      Court's attention.
                THE COURT: Before.
 2
                MS. BECKER: Yes, immediately.
 3
                THE COURT: Fine. Why don't you have a seat in
 4
      the hall.
 5
                MS. BECKER: Just as Ms. Porter finished making
 6
 7
      her statement and Mr. Zook indicated that he had some
      things to say, Ms. Canen said "bitch" right at the
 8
      witness. The witness saw it, and she was visibly
 9
10
      effected by it. I would request that Ms. Canen be
      removed from the courtroom, sanctioned, or warned that
11
12
      she or any of her representatives not threaten this
13
      witness any further.
14
                THE COURT: All right. Ms. Canen, you've heard
      what Ms. Becker said. Is that correct?
15
16
                MS. CANEN: I don't recall.
17
                THE COURT: I can't hear you.
                MS. CANEN: I don't recall.
18
19
                THE COURT: You don't recall.
2.0
                MS. CANEN: I looked at her.
                THE COURT: Well, I'm telling you right now
21
      that's the end of that conduct if you did any such thing.
22
23
      It's not going to happen again in this courtroom.
24
                MS. CANEN: She is lying.
25
                THE COURT: If it happens again, you'll be
```

```
removed from the courtroom; or you'll be put behind a
 1
      screen where you can hear the witness but cannot see her.
 2
 3
      Do you understand me?
                MS. CANEN: Yes.
 4
                THE COURT: I'm not going to tolerate it.
 5
      Understand me?
 6
 7
                MS. CANEN: Yes.
                THE COURT: Mr. Royer, same for you.
 8
      Understood?
 9
10
                MR. ROYER: I understand.
                THE COURT: All right. Now, tell me,
11
12
      Mr. Williams, what information you're seeking from this
13
      witness? The first section appears to be the control
14
      issues.
                MR. WILLIAMS: Correct, your Honor.
15
                THE COURT: Let's take them one at a time.
16
17
      Mr. Zook, Mr. Crawford, it would appear the evidence
      related to the control issue would be evidence of habit
18
      or some other such matter. Agree or disagree? Not a
19
2.0
      Bruton Rule issue.
21
                MR. ZOOK: I don't think it's a Bruton Rule
22
      issue, no.
23
                THE COURT: Okay. Do you have any problem with
24
      that portion of the testimony?
                MR. ZOOK: Yes, I do. I think it's offered --
25
```

```
I think what's being done is they're offering to show
 1
      that it's a habit to perform robberies simply because --
 2
                THE COURT: Well, no, no. We're not talking
 3
      about the same thing. The testimony from this witness
 4
      was if Lana told Mr. Royer to go outside, he would go
 5
      outside. If she told him to turn around, he would turn
 6
 7
      around. That's the end of that portion of the testimony.
                MR. ZOOK: It doesn't sound like a habit to me
 8
 9
      Okay.
                THE COURT: Well, do you have any objection to
10
      that portion of the testimony?
11
12
                MR. ZOOK: Not if that's what she saw; however,
13
      I don't see how it relates to the case.
14
                THE COURT: Well, and I'm trying to find out if
      you have an objection to that testimony.
15
16
                MR. ZOOK: I would object because it seems to
17
      be prejudicial in this context.
                THE COURT: A confession in any case is the
18
      most prejudicial piece of evidence you can have most
19
2.0
      certainly, right, but sometimes those are admissible.
      What is your specific objection other than it's
21
      prejudicial?
22
23
                MR. ZOOK: That it outweighs the probative
24
      value of that type of evidence.
                THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Crawford, any objection?
25
```

MR. CRAWFORD: Same objection, your Honor. But I would echo the habit issue as well too because we don't know how often she saw these individuals together. We don't know if there were times specifically when Andy didn't do what was said. We don't know whether or not just simply going outside is a control issue necessarily, and I don't think it's relevant specifically in this case. And, again, it would -- the probative value of it would certainly be outweighed by the prejudicial value of it.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Williams, I suppose your position is the opposite theirs.

MR. WILLIAMS: It is.

THE COURT: How did I guess. I think it has some probative value, and I think you Mr. Zook and you Mr. Crawford will be permitted to explore just the issues that you raised. We'll let the jury decide what weight it has. The next point from this witness relates to Zanex Valium in the alleged possession of Ms. Canen, and Ms. Canen allegedly saying she traded the pills for pot or money. What's your position, Mr. Zook? This is point two.

MR. ZOOK: Well, obviously, Judge, my position is that that's evidence of another crime.

THE COURT: 404(B).

```
MR. ZOOK: Right.
 1
                THE COURT: And we already had the 404(B)
 2
      arguments, and I sided with you on that.
 3
                MR. ZOOK: Right.
 4
                THE COURT: Do you have anything different on
 5
      that?
 6
 7
                MR. ZOOK: No. I could go over it all, but
      I'll spare you --
 8
                THE COURT: I don't think you need to. It's in
 9
10
      the record. Your reason's already in the record. Mr.
      Crawford, how about you?
11
12
                MR. CRAWFORD: It doesn't effect me per say,
13
      but I'll note with what Mr. Zook has said.
14
                THE COURT: So you're going to say me too.
15
                MR. CRAWFORD: Me too.
16
                THE COURT: Me too. I thought that's what you
      might say. Mr. Williams, what do you have to say
17
      different than what you've told me before? Anything new?
18
19
                MR. WILLIAMS: I believe Ms. Becker arqued that
20
      so I would just add, Judge, that now the evidence is in
21
      regarding the fingerprints, and that is one of the
      questions you had with that was going to come in or not.
22
23
      The state's belief that the fingerprint is on a
24
      Rubbermaid tub that contains the prescription medication
      that it was moved based upon the testimony of various
2.5
```

```
witnesses and that it is her fingerprint.
 1
                THE COURT: Well, that wasn't really the point
 2
 3
      that I was trying to make. Maybe I did so in a
      not-too-clear fashion. My problem was the state was not
 4
      in a position to prove any drugs were taken at the time
      the event on trial here occurred. If that is the case,
 6
 7
      it would appear to be offered to have more to do with her
      character rather than the offense. How do you link it
 8
      up? That's my question.
 9
10
                MR. WILLIAMS: It goes to conduct because she
11
      moved the pills.
12
                THE COURT: Okay. what conduct.
13
                MR. WILLIAMS: The conduct of moving the pills.
14
                THE COURT: Okay. How would I conclude that
      Ms. Canen moved the pills from evidence that she had
15
      prescription bottles in a bag six months later? How
16
      would I conclude that?
17
                MR. WILLIAMS: From the state's perspective, it
18
      goes to the fact that with regard to this case by moving
19
2.0
      the pill box from its location to another location which
      is conduct --
21
                THE COURT: Well, she didn't take it.
22
23
                MR. WILLIAMS: Well, we don't know that.
24
                THE COURT: And that's what I'm trying get at.
```

You don't know that. You don't have any evidence to

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

prove that. If you had evidence to prove that drugs were taken, my ruling would be exactly the opposite of what I'm thinking right now; and I think I would admit the evidence, but you have no evidence that drugs were taken. So if she's in possession of drugs, that appears to me to be a problem under 404(B) because (A) it's remote in time. It's like six months later after the fact. And (B) they were prescription drugs. So far I don't have any testimony that it's not legal for her to have these -- no testimony has been presented so far to let me know if it's her prescription, someone else's prescription, someone else's drugs. I don't know. I don't have enough to support the admission of this right now. Is there anything else you have? MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor. THE COURT: I don't think I'm going to change my prior ruling. I think the prejudicial value in this case does outweigh the probative value. It can't be

THE COURT: I don't think I'm going to change my prior ruling. I think the prejudicial value in this case does outweigh the probative value. It can't be connected up to drugs that were taken in the alleged robbery and it's remote in time. It's evidence of another crime potentially the trading of the pills for marijuana or cash, and it would appear to go more to her character rather than be probative.

I'm going to stick with my prior ruling. The next one, "Lana would ask for money, and if she didn't

```
get what she asked for she got angry." What's your
 1
      position, Mr. Zook?
 2
 3
                MR. ZOOK: That's not a robbery, and if I had
      questioned the witness I would have questioned her more
 4
      concerning whether threats had been made, but I don't
 5
      think that that's relevant to this case.
 6
 7
                THE COURT: All right. What about Mr. Royer
      being present and the conversation about asking about
 8
      whether or not the witness was a good candidate?
 9
10
                MR. ZOOK: I have no idea what that means,
11
      Judge.
12
                THE COURT: Well, aren't we jumping right in
13
      the middle of a Bruton Rule problem with that?
14
      Mr. Royer's conduct is his answer. He shakes his head
      and looks down. How does he get cross-examined on that
15
16
      if he doesn't take the witness stand? Do you have
17
      anything else to say on the anticipated testimony?
18
                MR. ZOOK: No, sir.
19
                THE COURT: Mr. Crawford.
2.0
                MR. CRAWFORD: I echo the Court's concerns.
                THE COURT: You have no evidence in this
21
      particular instance when Ms. Sailor became deceased that
22
23
      Lana Canen got angry.
24
                MS. BECKER: We do, but we can't enter it.
25
                THE COURT: Okay. You have none that you're
```

going to be using.

2.0

MS. BECKER: Correct.

THE COURT: I think we're barking up the wrong tree, and it's a dangerous tree. I don't think we're going to admit that evidence. I think there's a Bruton Rule problem with the conduct when both defendants are present.

MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, if I may just interject.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. WILLIAMS: I didn't put this evidence on because we don't believe there's a problem, there's a statement that Lana Canen made to Nina Porter in July, 3, 2003. In that statement, the testimony the state believes will come will be that Lana stated that there was an old lady that she could get money from, and that she was going to get some money from. But when she got -- or when she went to this older woman for money, she refused. The older woman refused to give the money to Lana because someone had told this older woman not to give her the money, meaning not to give Lana the money.

And that the demeanor when these statements were made will ask Ms. Porter, I believe, will be that it appeared that Lana was blaming this older lady for not doing these things. I don't specifically remember if she was going to say that she was angry, but that's how we

```
believe it relates to now subsequent to that now Nina
 1
      Porter observes these things going on when money is asked
 2
      for --
 3
                THE COURT: Well, you're asking me to rule on
 4
      something I haven't heard. Standing alone if Lana Canen
 5
      asked her for money and was told no and then Lana Canen
 6
      got angry, that concerns me because you have nothing to
 7
      go with it. If you have something to go with it, I guess
 8
      I'd like to know that before the jury hears it.
 9
10
                MR. WILLIAMS: Well, we can present the
11
      testimony.
                THE COURT: Well, tell me what the testimony
12
13
      would be. Just what you told me here a minute ago.
14
                MR. WILLIAMS: Specifically with regard to your
      question, yes, that's how it -- that portion relates
15
16
      to --
17
                THE COURT: What is the time frame she asked
      the older woman for money?
18
19
                MR. WILLIAMS: Thanksqiving.
2.0
                THE COURT: Okay. Is there any reason you know
      of why that wouldn't be admissible, Mr. Zook, as an
21
      admission?
22
23
                MR. ZOOK: That's what I understood they were
24
      offering it for, but I didn't recall that it happened
2.5
      Thanksqivinq.
```

MR. WILLIAMS: It didn't happen at 1 2 Thanksgiving. There are three statements that Nina 3 Porter will testify to. THE COURT: Okay. Let me see if I understand 4 it. Nina porter is positioned to potentially give 5 testimony that in a conversation with Lana Canen, Lana 6 7 Canen related an event of asking an older woman for money and the older woman refused because someone had indicated 8 she shouldn't do that. 9 10 MR. WILLIAMS: Correct. And in addition to 11 that statement, there will be a statement that no one was 12 supposed to get hurt, and she states, "Thanksgiving, 13 thanks for giving death." Those statements are not one 14 after another. They are over a period of time. THE COURT: I understand; I understand. Well, 15 I think that's a whole different matter. Mr. Zook, why 16 17 would these not be admissions by a party opponent? MR. ZOOK: Your Honor, in all honesty I think 18 that perhaps the state should be able to use that, but I 19 2.0 don't understand how they would get into the other times when they allege that Lana would get mad when she asked 21 for money, things like that. 22 23 THE COURT: Yeah. I think you're right, and I

think that's what my ruling will be. But I think the

information that you've related outside of the witness's

24

2.5

present here -- presence here, Mr. Williams, I think that would be admissible. Statement against penal interest, admission by a party opponent, any number of ways, shapes or forms that could come in. Does that answer your question that you had raised now?

2.0

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, it does, your Honor.

THE COURT: We all kind of on the same page.

MR. CRAWFORD: Just want to make sure which ones you ruled on to come in and which can't.

THE COURT: I think this is going to come in, the conversation Mr. Williams had with the witness relative to Ms. Canen telling Mr. Royer to do something and he did it. She gave two examples. Turn around; go outside. That little portion of the testimony I think is admissible.

The other portion is the portion that the witness did not actually give formal testimony to here in the courtroom. Mr. Williams told us what the testimony was anticipated to be, and that was relating to the conversation with the older woman and the part about Thanksgiving. Asking the older woman for money. The older woman said, no. Someone apparently had told her not to give her money. Those parts would be admissible the rest would not.

MR. CRAWFORD: I would also appreciate your

```
Honor if Mr. Williams wouldn't use the word control when
 1
      he uses that.
 3
                MR. WILLIAMS: Would you rather have
      manipulate?
 4
                MR. CRAWFORD: No.
                THE COURT: I'm not going to tell lawyers what
 6
 7
      to ask because if I did, it would shorten trial
      substantially. Let's take a break before we start up
 8
 9
      again.
10
                     (A recess was taken.)
                     (The Court convened with all the
11
12
                     parties present, and the following
13
                     proceedings were had in open court.)
14
                THE COURT: The defendants are present, counsel
      for the defendants are present, counsel for the state is
15
      present, the witness is present, and multiple persons are
16
      present in the courtroom. Those of you in the audience
17
      section, keep your thoughts to yourself. I don't want
18
19
      you making any editorial comments by facial gestures or
2.0
      otherwise with respect to the testimony. Ms. Canen and
      Mr. Royer, likewise for you. Understood, Ms. Canen?
21
                MS. CANEN: Yes.
22
23
                THE COURT: Mr. Royer, understand.
24
                MR. ROYER: Yes, I do.
25
                THE COURT: Thank you.
```

1	(The jury entered the courtroom and		
2	the following proceedings were had.)		
3	THE COURT: Be seated please. Mr. Williams.		
4	MR. WILLIAMS: Thank your, your Honor.		
5	NINA PORTER		
6	called on behalf of the State, having been first duly		
7	sworn, testified as follows:		
8	DIRECT EXAMINATION		
9	BY MS. BECKER:		
10	Q Could you introduce yourself to the jury?		
11	A My name is Nina porter.		
12	Q And, Nina, so that everybody can hear you, could		
13	you speak up a little bit? Where do you reside?		
14	A I live in Goshen, Indiana.		
15	Q Where do you work?		
16	A Lippert Components.		
17	Q How long have you been working at Lippert		
18	Components?		
19	A Almost six months.		
20	Q And what do you do for Lippert Components?		
21	A I'd head of line two's quality control.		
22	Q So you quality control for them.		
23	A Yes.		
24	Q What does Lippert what does Lippert Components		
25	make?		

A lot of things, but I do RV frames. 1 Α How old are you? 2 3 Α Thirty. Now, I want to take you back to November 28, 2002, 4 it was Thanksqiving day, where were you living at 5 that time? 6 7 Indiana Women's Prison. Α THE COURT: Excuse me for a moment. Ms. 8 9 Porter, I need to ask you one additional question. 10 the jury's absence, were you placed under oath? THE WITNESS: Yes, I was. 11 12 THE COURT: And you understand you're still 13 under oath? 14 THE WITNESS: Yes. 15 THE COURT: Proceed. 16 BY MR. WILLIAMS: 17 Now, you said on November 28, 2002, which was Thanksgiving, you were in Indiana Women's Prison. 18 Is that right? 19 20 А Yes. And why were you there? 21 Q Violation of probation. 22 23 Q And what was the violation of probation related to 24 as far as a conviction for something? 2.5 Α Yes.

- 698 1 0 And what was the conviction for? 2 Α Welfare fraud and forgery. And as a result of those convictions, ultimately 3 Q you had to go to prison? 4 I was placed on home detention, and I violated. 5 How long were you in the Indiana Women's Prison for 6 Q 7 that probation violation? One year. Α 8 Do you remember the dates from when you went in 9 Q 10 till when you got out? I was arrested in July of 2002, and then I was 11 12 released February of 2003. 13 Q So you were released from the Indiana Women's 14 Prison sometime in February of 2003. Yes. 15 Α 16 Q Do you have any other convictions for conversion or check deception or anything like that? 17 18 Α Yes. With respect to your forgery and welfare fraud, why 19 20 did you commit those crimes? MR. ZOOK: Objection, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Sustained. 22 23 BY MR. WILLIAMS: 24 Do you know Lana Canen?
 - Yes, I do.

Α

- 1 Q How do you know her?
- 2 A I lived upstairs in the same apartment building.
- 3 Q What apartment building was that?
- 4 A At 124 Johnson Street.
- 5 Q Was that in Elkhart?
- 6 A Yes.
- 7 Q And when did you move into that location?
- 8 A April of 2003.
- 9 Q Now, did you move there after you had gotten out of
- 10 prison?
- 11 A Yes, I did.
- 12 Q And do you recall when you moved out?
- 13 A September of 2003.
- 14 Q Did Lana Canen live in the same apartment building?
- 15 A Yes.
- 16 Q Describe this apartment building for us?
- 17 A There's four apartments in the same converted
- house: two upstairs, two downstairs.
- 19 Q Was it a larger house?
- 20 A Not for four apartments, no.
- 21 Q Which apartment did you live in?
- 22 A I lived in No. 1.
- Q And where was No. 1?
- 24 A Upstairs on the left.
- 25 Q So you lived upstairs in the building.

700 1 Α Yes. Where did Lana Canen live? 2 3 Α Downstairs on the right. She was on the first floor. 4 5 Α Yes. When you moved into the apartment complex in April 6 7 of 2003, did you meet Lana Canen? Α Yes. 8 Did you become friends with her? 9 10 Α Yes, I did. Now, do you see Lana Canen in the courtroom today? 11 12 Α Yes, I do. 13 Q Can you point out where she's seated and what she's 14 wearing? She's seated at the end of the table. She's 15 Α 16 wearing a blue plaid dress. That's the table to your left? 17 Д Yes. 18 MR. WILLIAMS: Your Honor, may the record 19 20 reflect the witness has identified the defendant Lana 21 Canen. THE COURT: The record will so reflect. 22 23 BY MR. WILLIAMS: 24 Do you know someone named Andrew Royer? 25 А Yes, I do.

- 1 Q And how did you meet Andrew Royer?
 - A Through Lana.
 - Q Do you see Andrew Royer in the courtroom today?
- 4 A Yes, I do.

3

7

8

9

10

- Q Can you point out where he is seated and what he is wearing?
 - A He's the second person at the table to my left in a brown shirt.
 - MR. WILLIAMS: May the record reflect that the witness has identified the defendant Andrew Royer the defendant.
- 12 THE COURT: The record will so reflect.
- 13 BY MR. WILLIAMS:
- Q Now, Lana, you knew both Andrew Royer and Lana
 Canen as of April 2003. Is that right?
- 16 A Yes.
- 17 Q Did you ever see them together?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q Were they friends?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Q How often did you see them together?
- 22 A Often.
- Q Did there ever come a time when you saw them together that you saw Lana control Andy's behavior?
- 25 A I seen Lana tell Andy what to do.

			702
1	Q	Give me an example.	
2		MR. ZOOK: I can't hear the witness.	
3		THE COURT: Speak up a little bit, ma'am.	
4	Q	Can you repeat your last answer?	
5	A	Lana would tell Andy what to do.	
6	Q	Can you give some examples of that?	
7	A	She could tell him to go outside and wait or to	
8		turn around. He would do it.	
9	Q	Was there any specific instance where she told him	
10		to go outside that you remember?	
11	A	Yes.	
12	Q	And describe that for the jury?	
13	A	She told Andy to go outside and wait, and he went	
14		outside and waited.	
15	Q	What was what was the weather conditions at that	
16		time?	
17	A	He was raining.	
18	Q	And Andy Royer went outside when Lana told him to	
19		do so.	
20	A	Yes.	
21	Q	Did he have anything covering him when he went	
22		outside?	
23	A	No. He just went outside.	
24	Q	So he would be rained on.	
25	A	Yes.	

- 1 Q How long was he outside for?
- 2 A He was still outside when I went upstairs almost a
- 3 half hour later.
- Q Lana, I want to take you to July 3rd of 2003. Do
- 5 you recall that day?
- 6 A Yes.
- 7 Q Why do you recall July 30, 2003?
- 8 A Because I'm a recovering addict, and I drank
- 9 alcohol on that day.
- 10 Q So it stands out in your mind because you lapsed.
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q From the time that you got out of prison in
- February of 2003 to July 3rd of 2003, had you drank
- 14 anything?
- 15 A No.
- Q Did you take -- did you take any drugs at all
- 17 between that time?
- 18 A No.
- 19 Q So you remember this day because you drank some
- 20 alcohol?
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 Q Anything else about that day that -- that makes it
- 23 stand out?
- 24 A The police came to our apartment building.
- Q We'll talk about the police coming to your

apartment building in just a minute. I want to 1 take you now to July 3, 2003 at nine o'clock in the 2 3 evening or thereabouts. Do you remember where you were? 4 5 Α Yes. Tell the jury? 6 7 I was outside on the patio in front of the Α apartment building drinking at a table with Lana. 8 Anybody else there? 9 Q 10 Α Her friend, Dan, and my boyfriend, Robby. At some point did Dan and Robby leave? 11 Q 12 Α Yes. 13 And did that just leave you and Lana? 14 Α Yes. Now, you say you had been drinking. How much did 15 0 16 you have to drink, do you remember? 17 Α We were drinking; no amount. At some point -- strike that. You say we were 18 Q drinking, you and Lana Canen were drinking? 19 20 Α Yes. At some point while you were there with Lana alone, 21 0 did she make any statements? 22 23 Α Yes. 24 Q What did she say? She said no one was supposed to get hurt. 25

- 705 Did you have any idea what that meant? 1 0 2 Α No. 3 Q Did she say that more than once? А Yes. 4 Did she say anything else? 5 Q She said she went upstairs to an old lady, and she 6 Α 7 said she could come and get money. When she got there, she couldn't give her the money because 8 someone told her not to. 9 10 Q Did you have any idea what she was talking about? No, I didn't. 11 Α 12 Now, at the time that Lana made these statements to Q 13 you, were you intoxicated? 14 Α I had been drinking. Were you drunk? 15 0 16 Α No, I wasn't. 17 Do you remember these statements vividly? 18 Α Yes. Now, you said something about the police coming. 19 Q 20 What happened with regard to that? Α The police came and told us that they were called 21 because someone had said we were drinking outside. 22 23
 - Now, were they called after Ms. Canen had made Q
 - these two statements?
- 25 Α Yes.

- 1 Q The statements that she made were they one after another?
- 3 A No.

8

9

10

11

- Q Do you know how much time was in between the statements?
- 6 A No, I don't.
 - Q So she made the first statement about no one getting hurt and then sometime later she made the statement regarding an old lady that she would get money from, was going to get money from, but that woman refused because someone told her not to. Is that correct?
- 13 A Yes.
- Q Well, the police come because you are drinking outside. Did you have contact with the police?
- 16 A Yes, we did.
- 17 Q Did they tell you why they were there?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q Did they arrest you for public intoxication?
- 20 A No.
- Q Did there come a time that evening that you went inside?
- 23 A Yes.
- 24 Q Did Lana go inside?
- 25 A Lana went inside first.

- 1 Q So Lana left this patio area.
- 2 A Yes.
- 3 Q And this patio area was outside of the apartment
- 4 complex.
- 5 A Yes.
- 6 On the first floor.
- 7 A Yes.
- 8 Q So she was leaving to go back to her apartment.
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q Just after the police had been there.
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q Did she make any statements as she left?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 Q What did she say?
- 15 A She mumbled "Thanksgiving, thanks for giving
- 16 death."
- 17 Q Thanksgiving, thanks for a giving death.
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q Did you have any idea what she was talking about?
- 20 A No.
- 21 Q When Lana Canen made these statements to you, did
- 22 you have any idea who Helen Sailor was?
- 23 A No, I did not.
- 24 Q Did you ever hear of the murder of Helen Sailor?
- 25 A No, I did not.

- 708 1 What was her demeanor when she said these things? 0 2 Α She was angry. 3 Q Nina, how did you get involved in this case? I got pulled over with Lana in my vehicle. 4 Α MR. ZOOK: I can't hear that. 5 THE WITNESS: I got pulled over. 6 7 And you said Lana was in your vehicle. Α Yes. 8 Were the two of you separated? 9 Q 10 Α Yes, we were. Now, were you interviewed by the police with regard 11 Q 12 to this case? 13 Α Yes, I was. 14 Q And do you remember who you talked to at the police department? 15 16 Α No, do not. Was it a detective? 17 Q Yes. It was two detectives. 18 Α And did you tell them everything that you told the 19 Q 20 jury here today? Α Yes. 21 Was it during this interview that you realized that 22 23 -- strike that -- at some point did the interview
- 25 A Yes, it did.

end?

And after the interview ends, is that when you 1 learned that Helen Sailor had been killed on 2 Thanksgiving day of 2002? 3 After I was done. 4 А 5 MR. WILLIAMS: No further questions, your 6 Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Zook. 7 CROSS-EXAMINATION 8 BY MR. ZOOK: 9 10 Ms. Porter, as I understand it you were picked up by a police officers what was that for? 11 12 To come to the --Α 13 Q I still can't hear you? 14To come to the police department to make a statement. 15 16 You were picked up to make a statement? Yes, I was. 17 Α I thought they pulled you over for some other 18 Q 19 reason? 20 Α They pulled me over and arrested Lana and gave me a ticket. 21 Okay. What was the ticket? 22 23 Α Driving with no driver's license. 24 0 Okay. Now, were you on probation at that time?

2.5

А

Yes, I was.

- Q Did anything happen to your probation?
- 2 A Not at that point.
- 3 Q And it was later that you were violated?
- 4 A Yes.

8

- Q Okay. When you were violated, did you go back to prison?
- 7 A Yes, I did.
 - Q But that time you told them that Lana had told you about some woman that didn't give her money.
- 10 Right?
- 11 A Yes.
- Q Okay. Now, what was the period of time that you talked with Lana while you were sitting outside drinking?
- 15 A We were outside for more than two hours.
- 16 Q Two hours?
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 Q You have a soft voice, and it's just not going with
 19 my ears very well. So during that two hour period
 20 Lana would say some things, and you remembered some
 21 of them.
- 22 A Yes.
- Q And the three things she said that -- that we're talking about here are the one thing about the woman who didn't give her money.

- 1 A Yes.
- 3 A Yes.

2

- 4 Q And something else, what was that?
- 5 A No one was supposed to get hurt.
- 6 0 What?
- 7 A No one was supposed to get hurt.
- Q No one was supposed to get hurt. Okay. Did Lana
 ever say anything about Helen Sailor?

And the thing about Thanksgiving death.

- 10 A No, she did not.
- Q Did Lana have the bottle you were drinking from?
- 12 A The bottle was on the table.
- 13 Q Outside?
- 14 A Yes.
- 15 Q What kind of bottle?
- 16 A Root Beer Schnapps.
- 17 Q Okay. Was it Lana's bottle?
- 18 A I believe the alcohol we bought for us to drink out
 19 there that night. I'm not sure whose bottle.
- 20 Q Who took the bottle inside?
- 21 A I don't remember.
- 22 Q You don't remember Lana picking up the bottle and
- taking it inside as she made that comment?
- 24 A I don't remember anything about the bottle. I just
- 25 remember her going inside.

```
Q
            Okay.
 1
                MR. ZOOK: Pass the witness.
 2
                THE COURT: Mr. Crawford.
 3
                MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you, your Honor.
 4
                          CROSS-EXAMINATION
 5
      BY MR. CRAWFORD:
 6
 7
            Ms. Porter, I want to talk about July 3, 2003. You
            mentioned that present at that time were yourself.
 8
            Yes.
 9
        Α
10
        Q
            Ms. Canen.
11
        Α
            Yes.
            A friend of Ms. Canen's name Dan. Is that correct?
12
13
        Α
           Yes.
14
        Q
            Was he a boyfriend?
            I'm not sure what their relationship was.
15
        Α
            And your boyfriend was also present. Is that
16
        Q
17
            correct?
18
        A
            Yes.
            And Andrew Royer was not present. Is that correct?
19
        Q
20
        А
            That's correct.
                MR. ZOOK: No further questions, your Honor.
21
                THE COURT: Any other questions, sir?
22
23
                MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, Judge.
      1111
24
      1111
25
```

STATE'S WITNESS - NINA PORTER - (REDIRECT)

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. WILLIAMS:

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

- Q Nina, how often or how many times did Lana Canen repeat the phrase "no one was supposed to get hurt"?
- A Several times.
- Q What about the statement that she made to you regarding the old lady that she would get money from and said she could come and get the money from her, but then when she got there she refused because someone told her not to give her the money.

 What -- how many times did she say that?
- A One time.
- What about the comment that you said that Lana stated as she was going inside "Thanksgiving, thanks for giving death" how many times did she say that?
- 18 A One time.
 - Q No further questions.
 - MR. ZOOK: No questions.
- MR. CRAWFORD: No questions, your Honor.
- 22 THE COURT: You may step down. Watch your
- 23 step, please. Is she released from her subpoena?
- MS. BECKER: Yes.
- MR. ZOOK: Yes.

```
MR. CRAWFORD: Yes.
 1
                THE COURT: She'll be released from her
 2
 3
      subpoena. Call your next witness.
                MS. BECKER: Your Honor, at this time the State
 4
 5
      of Indiana rests it's case.
                THE COURT: The State of Indiana has rested.
 6
 7
                MR. ZOOK: Mr. Zook, may I have a minute, your
      Honor?
 8
 9
                THE COURT: May you have a minute in the
10
      courtroom or with the jury --
                MR. ZOOK: In the courtroom.
11
12
                THE COURT: In the courtroom, you may.
                MR. ZOOK: Your Honor, defendant Canen rests.
13
14
                THE COURT: The defendant Ms. Lana Canen has
      rested. Mr. Crawford.
15
16
                MR. CRAWFORD: Your Honor, Mr. Royer rests as
17
      well.
                THE COURT: Mr. Royer has rested. Ladies and
18
      gentlemen, that concludes the evidence in this case.
19
2.0
      We're going to take a recess at this time, and what we're
21
      going to do is sit down with counsel, try to finalize the
      instructions as quickly as we can. Counsel have worked
22
23
      over the long noon hour to facilitate this case moving
24
      along. So what we need to do is get our final
      instructions in final form, get them copied so that each
2.5
```

of you will have a copy.

2.0

As soon as that is accomplished, we'll bring you back; and we'll complete the trial, and we'll complete the trial by this. Both the state and the defendant's counsel will have an opportunity to make their final arguments based upon the evidence that has been presented. We'll have that. We'll furnish each of you with a set of final instructions. I'll read the final instructions to you for the record, and then you'll retire to deliberate. Before you leave the courtroom, I need to remind you one more time.

You are all jurors in this case. I must tell you now and I will repeat this again each time you are permitted to separate.

Generally, you should not express any opinion about the case before it is submitted to you for deliberation; however, you are permitted to discuss the evidence presented in this case amongst yourselves in the jury room during recesses from trial. All jurors and alternates must be present during these discussions. You must reserve judgment about the outcome of the case until your deliberations begin.

You are admonished that you may not discuss the facts of the case with anyone other than your fellow jurors.

You may not discuss this case with me, with the lawyers, parties or with any of the witnesses.

2.0

You should not listen to or read any outside or media accounts of the trial. You may not investigate the case or attempt to obtain information outside the courtroom. It is highly improper for you to do so. You are to consider and decide this case only upon the evidence received during the course of the trial here in the courtroom.

Before I turn you over to the bailiff, I'm going to tell you that it is the policy of this court to take your cell phones from you during deliberations.

This would be a golden opportunity for you to use your cell phones to make whatever arrangements you need to make to let people know that you're going to be here with us in the Elkhart Circuit Court for a while. We'll not take the phones until the deliberations begin. You'll be in care of the bailiff.

(A short recess was taken.)

THE COURT: The record should reflect that each defendant is present, counsel for each defendant is present, counsel for the state is present. Court has with the assistance of counsel prepared final instructions and two verdict forms. Mr. Zook, with respect to the verdict form for if each defendant, are

```
agreeable to you.
 1
                MR. ZOOK: Yes. Sir.
 2
                THE COURT: And, Mr. Crawford, are they
 3
      agreeable to you.
 4
                MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, your Honor.
                THE COURT: And, Ms. Becker, are the verdict
 6
 7
      forms agreeable to you?
                MS. BECKER: Yes, your Honor.
 8
                THE COURT: With respect to the final
 9
10
      instructions, Mr. Zook, do you have any objections?
                MR. ZOOK: No, your Honor.
11
12
                THE COURT: And, Mr. Crawford.
1.3
                MR. CRAWFORD: No, your Honor.
14
                THE COURT: And, Ms. Becker.
15
                MS. BECKER: No, your Honor.
16
                THE COURT: We've discussed final arguments.
17
      We've agreed there will not be a limit, although at a
      certain point in time the Court will urge counsel to wind
18
19
      up their arguments. Are we ready to proceed?
2.0
                MS. BECKER: Yes.
                MR. ZOOK: Yes.
21
                THE COURT: Mr. Crawford.
22
23
                MR. CRAWFORD: Yes.
24
                THE COURT: Those of you seated in the audience
      section, I would appreciate your assistance. Out of
25
```

respect for the jury, I ask that you keep your thoughts to yourself, that you not make any facial gestures, or other movement that would detract the jury from their duties.

2.0

(The jury entered the courtroom, and the following proceedings were had.)

THE COURT: Be seated, please. Ladies and gentlemen, as you know the evidence has now been concluded in this case. What we're going to do now is hear the final arguments of counsel. These statements of counsel are not evidence. They are statements by counsel intended to persuade you to their particular way of thinking with respect to the evidence.

State of Indiana of Indiana has the burden of proof in this matter. It's for that reason the state of Indiana will be permitted to address you both first and last. Ms. Becker.

MS. BECKER: Thank you, your Honor.

CLOSING STATEMENT

MS. BECKER: Thanksgiving day, Thanksgiving eve of 2002 was profound for many people. Don't know what you were doing, but Helen Sailor was getting strangled in her own home. Helen Sailor's personal belongings were was being rifled through by two intruders. Helen Sailor, her body was being offended even further by pouring juice

or oil or some kind of substance on it as she lay there cold on that tile floor. It wasn't enough just to kill her. It wasn't enough just to wrap something around her neck whether it be hands and then later a cord, ironically enough her lifeline. It wasn't enough.

2.0

Instead, they had to just to keep doing things, and then they had to take her things. Take her money out of her Bible, the large print Bible. We can go on and on about all the offensive things that surrounded this murder, but you're going to have plenty of time to think about those in a little bit.

What we want to do at this point is wrap this case together because as you heard and as we talked to you about during opening statements, it's kind of disjointed. There's lots of little pieces, little pieces here, little pieces there. And as Mr. Williams talked about, you know, when you're putting a puzzle together the gentleman that sat right back there in that seat said, yeah, sometimes I clump some things, and then it starts to fill in the rest of way. And we talked constantly about the fact that, you know, you don't have to have every piece of the puzzle. You don't have to have the picture box in order to see what it is.

And, folks, as these last couple of days have gone, every single one of you can see that picture. You

can see that writing on the wall. What was the writing on the wall. There you go. Let's start with that one. Thanksgiving. Thanks for giving death. Out of the mouth of Lana Canen. The day before Independence Day, the day before fourth of July 2003, as she sat on the patio with Nina Porter drinking some Root Beer Schnapps just hanging out. And what does she keep saying? No one was supposed to get hurt. That statement, folks, no one was supposed to get hurt is incredibly profound for what reason? There was a plan. No one was supposed to get hurt. What does that do? Corroborate virtually every piece of evidence that came from that stand. No one was supposed to get hurt and yet Helen did. It wasn't their intent to kill her when they went to her home. It was their intent to get money from her, money.

Once again, out of the mouth of Lana Canen, you got her talking about the fact that she would go up to the old lady's apartment, the old lady that she'd get money from, the old lady. A lot of respect as she'd go up there and mooch money from Helen Sailor. But then the day that she refused to give money, Thanksgiving, was the day that she was given death.

Now, what do you think was in her mind? How profound do you think this was to her where eight months later as she's drinking she keeps repeating over and over

again no one was supposed to get hurt. She just was supposed to give us the money, give me the money.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

And then you got Andrew Royer. We could go through -- I could play that tape over again for you. You can listen to it over again if you want to in the jury room when you're deliberating. But there were a few things on that tape that are so important because it pulls it all together again. Andrew Royer talked about the fact that he strangled her for a long time, five, ten minutes. Look at the clock right now. It is 3:42ish. And in another five or ten minutes, let's look at that clock and see how long it is. If I stood here silent for five or ten minutes, it would seem like an eternity. How do you think it felt to Helen Sailor as he continued to strangle her? And Dr. Prahlow, this is why it's important, explained to you this didn't happen fast -- or didn't happen fast at all. It was repeated movement of the ligature. You saw up on the screen, and these are going to go back with you so you can look at them closer, the different placements of the ligature.

In State's Exhibit 13 you can see the little texture lines. How much pressure do you think had to be exerted against this in order to make those pressure lines? Pressure lines on the back of her neck. Also, profoundly important from his statement you saw on the

slide the criss cross. Comes down like this and ends here. They don't meet up. How did Andrew Royer demonstrate that he strangled Helen? I'm quite sure that Andrew Royer had not had an opportunity to meet with Dr. Prahlow to find out about that little detail before he give his statement.

2.0

2.5

He had such intimate knowledge about this crime that there's no other way to explain it, folks. But what did he say? It was a money thing, and she just happened to be the victim. Even when he gave his statement, although he said he was sorry, the underlying current, she just happened to be there.

The defendant Lana Canen statements. She wouldn't give me the money. Her death is her own fault. The callousness that these two exhibited during the crime by pouring these things on her body, after the crime by making these statements. We can never ever understand what each individual one was thinking. Our minds don't work that way. We should be happy our minds don't work that way because then when you talk about this woman in the condition that she was, she just happened to be a victim. That's a problem.

Let's talk about the evidence, ladies and gentlemen. Over the last two days you have heard from numerous witnesses from the State of Indiana. Some of

2.0

2.5

them very very quick. Some of them took a little more time. Caroline Hoffer, first witness, she was able to explain to you what she saw and how things occurred.

Remember, the door was locked when she got there. Had to have Larry and Carol Converse come and unlock the door.

That door had to be locked from the outside. Why is that important? Because the perpetrators couldn't have locked it from the inside and left. They would have had to have thought, we want to lock this door from the outside.

What did it take? It took a key. It took a key. Low and behold, Helen's key ring was empty, the key ring that held her apartment key. They didn't take the whole key ring. They just took her key. Think of the detail of that because we're going to talk about that in a little bit.

The Bible, giant print addition of the Holy
Bible in which Helen would keep several hundred dollars
anywhere from 100 to several hundred. She kept it there
for extra money. After this crime was over, the money
was gone. It had been taken. There's the robbery,
folks.

Now, you can look at this from several different perspectives. You can also see that jewelry had been taken. Andrew Royer talked about the fact that jewelry had been taken from the jewelry box, the red

jewelry box that was underneath the bed. Broken clasp still under the bed. Remember how he talked about the fact that he cleaned things up, organized things, put things back so that it didn't look like they'd been tampered with. Except for the fact that it was broken, it was right back under the corner of the bed. Things were wiped down. Lots of smears Detective Bourdon testified to. Lots of smears, had a hard time getting fingerprints.

2.5

The medical tub, incredibly important because that was one piece of forensics evidence that we were able to have. And what did Caroline Hoffer add about the medical tub? That's been with since she came back from Georgia in 1997. Same medical tub.

Carol Converse -- I'm sorry, that was Carol

Converse talked about the same since 1997. Caroline

talked about all the different items that had been

disturbed as well. Her walker was still in the living.

What could that tell us? That when she got home, she got

home, maybe put her food away, hadn't put her walker away

yet, and she had company because by 8:45 this was done.

She didn't answer her phone anymore. Thanksgiving

evening was the time of the crime.

Dr. Prahlow established that the cause of death was the strangulation. He established for you she didn't

die quickly. The ligature had moved. The injuries were anywhere from a quarter of an inch to a full inch, and that she had defensive wounds on her hands. Look at these. And granted, elderly skin is frail. But a bruise that goes from your hand all the way up to your elbow. She was fighting him. Another bruise on the right hand, smaller bruises on her back side, two black eyes, abrasion on the chin, the abraded nose, the contusion on her forehead. All of these things. She was fighting him.

2.0

Detective Daggy testified about the investigation. Enlightened you a little bit about how difficult some investigations can be. Granted, you've got a situation where the individuals who may have been witnesses to the crime have perceptions that may be diminished a little bit, not as good as ours might be. That was a problem. That was a problem. Yet they kept working on this. And even though over the first few days and even into the first few months, they weren't able to get a resolution to this case, there were a couple red flags; but nothing that jumped out and said, here you go. Here's your suspect.

It took a break in the case, namely, Nina

Porter to start giving some intimate details so that they

could then go back and start doing some interviews. And

then things started falling into place. The context was there. Then the fact that Lana Canen was pacing out in front of the highrise Thanksgiving evening was important. When they got that information a couple days after the crime, it just wasn't all that important. Was it a red flag? Sure, it was. Was it enough? No.

2.5

The fact that Flo Macioce sees Charlie and sees
Lana that night doesn't fit into the context until you
start pulling things together, and then it all fits
together. After the crime, she wants to get out of
there. So what does she do? She packs a bag and high
tails it downstairs, and then Charlie takes her to her
boyfriend's house over at Bristol and Oslo. That's still
within the city of Elkhart, folks. It's only a couple
miles away. Sure as heck isn't out of town visiting
friends and relatives.

Now, Detective Daggy probably the most important thing he could add to this case was his interview with Andrew Royer later on, 2004. By that time, he'd already given his statement. He'd already expressed his concern about the fact that if he tells us what he really did, he's going to get into a lot of trouble. What has he done by now? Now his story, now his story is that he comes home from mom's for Thanksgiving dinner about 4:00 p.m. takes a nap, wakes

up, goes to Martins and gets beer. Gets really drunk and then goes back to bed.

2.0

2.5

And then the three witnesses right after that
Larry Haack from Martins Supermarket, folks, he didn't
get beer that night cause Martins was closed. It's
always closed on Thanksgiving. And he didn't go to bed
because he was at Martha Haff and Matt Johnson's
apartment. Do any of those people have any reason to
fabricate? You saw Martha. Not only did she not want to
be here, there was absolutely no reason for her to
fabricate, none whatsoever. And the fact that Andy was
up and awake and wanting to hang out and watch movies,
completely contradicts what he told Detective Daggy.

Then Charlie Lambert and Flo Macioce testified. Both of them individually put Lana Canen at the Waterfall Highrise the evening that Helen was murdered, and Charlie says he didn't leave there until I think it was 6:30, 6:45, somewhere in there. 6:30, 6:45 maybe that's when he got there, but it was still plenty of time to commit this murder because Carol and Larry dropped Helen off at the latest it would have been 5:45, 6ish, but it was somewhere between right after five until right before six, somewhere in there.

And we're quite sure Lana packed her bag and got out of there as fast as she could. Why? She's got a

1 little more ability for self-preservation.

Charlie Lambert had to say.

2.5

Self-preservation kicked in as you saw with Detective
Thayer, Judy Johnston, because Lana told each one of them
I was out of town visiting friends two days after the
murder. She already had her story down pat. And when
Detective Thayer tried to rouse her, at first she
wouldn't talk to him at all, and then she comes I was out
of town visiting friends and family. She tells Judy
Johnston I'm out of town visiting friends and family
directly in contradiction with what Flo Macioce and

Who had motive to fabricate? Charlie didn't want to be a part of this at all. Lana made him a part of this. Flo didn't want to be a part of this at all.

Lana made her a part of this. Nobody chooses witnesses in this case except for these two right here, and that's what we've got.

And by the time that this started to come together when Detective Conway went out to interview Andrew Royer, then things really started to make sense because an Andrew -- Andrew was in a position where he knew he had been had. And after the preinterview which defense wanted you to believe was so unreasonable, boy, they just pounded it into him. They put all those words in his mouth, and then he just recited everything that

the detectives wanted him to say.

2.5

Now, if that were the case, maybe we might actually have the real story about what happened because we'd all really like to know why Helen died that night. Is it pretty clear it had something to do with money? Yeah. But the closure of knowing how and why is not there because even when he started to think he came clean, he's still feeding us a line. And while he's got intimate details many many intimate details, he never tells us the whole story.

Intimate details such as I slapped her open handed on the cheek. I knocked her down in the kitchen. You saw the photograph of what appeared to be possibly a hair drag on the front of the stove. Do we know it's connected? No, absolutely not. Does it make sense? Yeah, the bruising on her nose, the major contusion on her head, any of those could have come from those areas. We don't know how those happened yet. But the only ones that can tell us that are the defendants, and Andrew Royer gave just enough intimate details to get the police off his back, at least he thought.

Now, during this preinterview, all the intimate details that came out started really making sense, and Detective Conway then wants to get this all on record.

He knows he's got it now. So what's he do? He brings

out that tape recorder, turns it on, Andrew Royer's demeanor changes pretty kick, so did his story. Granted, still gave a lot of intimate details of the crime but then tries to blame it on Helen. Just give me the money. What did he say? "I hit her hard enough that she got the point." How hard do you have to hit a woman like Helen to give her the point?

2.5

Then we start to come to the evidence against
Lana Canen. All of Tuesday was pretty much spent
focussing on what was against Andrew Royer. Today we
learned why Lana Canen is also guilty of this crime. We
started with Erika Roarhig, the home health nurse, who
has been taking care of Helen's meds for the last two
years. And she testified that that tub, this rubber tub,
I'm sorry, this plastic tub right here, the one that's
the most important piece of evidence in this case has
been with Helen ever since she's been there, two years,
and that their company would have bought another one for
her if they needed to replace it, but there was no need
to replace it. The tub that then Joel Bourdon testified
about had a usable print right back here.

Now, I don't know what your expectations were about fingerprints, I don't know what your training and experience is about fingerprints; but when you look at lifter M, this is what it's like trying to take

fingerprints, folks. You don't know when they were there, they get smudged, they get moved over, things go over them, and it's stuff to find a fingerprint. Between Detective Chapman and Detective Bourdon, individuals whose profession it is to tech crime scenes, hundreds of crime scenes, and in their experience fingerprints are not easy. Out of all the lifters that Detective Bourdon was able to get out of Helen's apartment, only one had enough identifiable ridge detail to make a comparison.

2.5

Now, he testified that there was lots of ridge detail. He found some things. He took several lifters. They did several -- or attempted several comparisons. They tried. How hard do you think they tried knowing that this case was going and going and going with no suspects, and forensic science still couldn't give them anything until this print. And by this time, things were starting to fall into place, August of 2003.

And immediately when interviewed, as Detective Lieutenant Snider indicated to you when confronted, what did Lana Canen say? I've never been in her apartment. You don't have a print. You don't have anything. But if you do, it couldn't be just one on a pill bottle because this is how I open a pill bottle. Nobody said anything about a pill bottle. And in light of the fact that Helen was blind, she wouldn't be having pill bottles out laying

around anyway like you heard from Caroline and Carol and Erika.

2.5

When they tried the pill bottle, no identifiable or no usable print as Detective Bourdon would testify. Nothing was usable. We got lucky. We got lucky, and she was counting on the fact that we wouldn't.

Now, Detective Chapman with the experience that he has explained how he then took the fingerprint card of Lana Canen, and he compared it to the print from the tub, and he said, yep, that print is Lana Canen's. Her left pinky -- left little finger. Lana's never been in that apartment before except when Helen Sailor was being murdered. Except when that pill container was being moved from the cupboard to the stove because as Erika testified, that pill container is always up in that cupboard.

Now, the little daily ones are stacked on top of each and pushed back right here between the stove and the sink, and the paper bag is up in the cupboard, but that little box is up on the cupboard. It wasn't up in the cupboard after the murder. It was up there before. So what's the only conclusion? The only reasonable conclusion, folks, is that the pill container was moved contemporaneous or near the same time of Helen's murder

and Lana's print was on it. Why would somebody move that? Get pills, look for valuables. Pills are liquid. Pills can be sold on the street. They're a commodity, folks. They're valuable not just to the person who needs them for medical reasons.

So it wasn't even enough to steal the money from her Bible. Had to rifle through her jewelry box too. Had to pour this liquid on her clothes and her dresser and the bed. You can almost just look at her and see her taking that bottle, shaking it all over the bed, look what I did, cause she was sure proud of it at the time.

What was Andrew Royer doing at this time?

Depending on which statement you want to think about,

whether it's -- it was a money thing, and she just

happened to be the victim, or the fact that she strangled

her for five to ten minutes. It was a long long time.

While he was cleaning up? Or think about this. Do you

remember how he talked about the fact that he dumped what

he thought were lotions on Helen's body to make her

decompose faster he thought, and you listen to his

statement and the way that he talked, you see his thought

processes, you hear Nina Porter's statement. He doesn't

talk much. Lana controls him. Andy, go stand in the

rain. And what did he do? He did it. Turn around,

leave, and he did it.

2.0

2.5

Why? Matt Johnson said it. He cared about

Lana. He had an interest in Lana. As Matt Johnston

stated, "He wanted to jump her bones," which at the time

there was quite a reaction to that. As we sit here now

and think about how disgusting that is. It's really

tough, but it's easy to understand that he did whatever

Lana told him to do.

So when you think about the fact that he was saying, poured lotion on her, make her decompose faster, have to wonder where he was. Was he freaking out because of what he had just done because he still had a little bit of a conscience and not paying attention to what Nina was doing -- or what Lana was doing? He thought they lotions. They weren't anything close to lotions. And while he had tons of details about the crime, you have to wonder. Is he just covering for somebody trying to take the blame himself and filling in gaps for the things he didn't do personally?

Because, boy, he remembered cleaning up, wiping things down with a towel and then throwing them down with a chute including the bottles. He remembered and those towels were in the chute, the bottle was in the chute. Think about that long and hard. Not that it's crucial, folks, it's not. Because to find them guilty, all you

have to do is look at the statement and see her fingerprint. That's enough evidence to find them guilty because the State of Indiana has to prove that they committed a robbery or attempted to commit a robbery. You got that from her statements. Nobody was supposed to get hurt. She just was supposed to give me money. Money is gone from Helen's apartment. There's the robbery, folks, and Helen is sure dead. That's all you have to find beyond a reasonable doubt.

But we know you're going to want to put this in perspective. You're going to want to put this in context. And all of these little things add up, and the only thing they add up to just as you heard the detectives that were involved in this case, Detective Thayer, Detective Snider, Detective Daggy most importantly because he went through all this, detective Conway, Detective Bourdon. All of them went through and talked about how they had through all this evidence they submitted to the lab. They tried so hard in order to find some way to vindicate Helen Sailor's death. And where did every road lead? Right here.

And this is the end of the road because now it is your opportunity to hold them accountable. Nobody else can do it but you. You have the power now to say you are guilty, and we know you are guilty, and now you

have to take responsibility for it cause you have to wonder then will Lana say once again Thanksgiving, thanks for a giving death. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Becker. Mr. Zook.

MR. ZOOK: Thank you.

2.5

CLOSING STATEMENT

MR. ZOOK: Well, that was certainly enlightening. I'm going to get to talk to you once. The prosecution will get to go twice. Mr. Crawford will talk to you after I talk. But I won't get to come up and refute anything that comes afterward, so I hope you'll pay attention. The psychologists generally tell us what you hear first and last is what you remember most. I'm in the middle. I hope you remember what I have to say.

First of all, I want to thank you all for paying attention. I can tell by your faces that it's -- that it's wearing on you. I can't imagine what people go through in California where they have such long trials. I don't they think meet for as long in the daytime, and it will be a longer period of time because I know you're going to talk about this among yourselves, and you're going to do the right thing, and you're going to look at the evidence that's been presented.

What we just heard was we heard about some evidence, and we heard about a lot of things that were

said and a lot of things that were mentioned such as my client throwing various substances on a body and so forth. This is speculation, and this is exactly what you were told about in the beginning by that prosecutor that you shouldn't be paying attention to.

2.0

2.5

What exactly is there in the way of evidence that ties Lana Canen to the crime? Nothing. There is a fingerprint, but there's no evidence that ties Lana Canen to this crime. You have some definite evidence that ties Mr. Royer to the crime, namely, that he admitted it.

Mr. Royer's statements don't tie Lana to the crime. They certainly tie himself to the crime. When you think about the things that are used to try to tie Lana to this crime, you have to say, well, there's a fingerprint.

There's some statements that she made allegedly to a person that testified against her, and there's some statements she made herself that were inconsistent with those. And when the police are talking to Lana, she says "I wasn't there." Gee, maybe I would have said that too.

The evidence of control. I guess -- remember in the first place in opening statements Ms. Becker said she was going to show that Lana was the mastermind.

Well, that word kind of sticks in your head, and then later on she tries to show that there is control by calling a witness that says she could tell Andrew to go

out in the rain, and Andrew would go out in the rain, and I got to thinking about that. And I thought if my wife told me to go wait for her, I'd probably go wait. If my wife told me to turn around, I'd probably turn around. I'd probably follow her from one room to the next like some guys do. But that doesn't mean that she has control when it comes to important things. It doesn't mean I go commit a robbery for her. And we don't really have any evidence that Lana Canen told Andy Royer to go commit a robbery. We got a bunch of things that look like it might have been, could have been, and we want to put it together so that we have this thing solved, and so that Andy Royer doesn't take the wrap by himself because the theory is he's too stupid to have done it by himself.

We have a fingerprint that was not on a wall, it was not on a piece of furniture, heavy piece, it was not on anything that is immovable in the room. It's on a bin that's easily carried, and that is similar to many bins. I guess we'll call it a bin. And, you know, one woman that is Helen's relative said that's the same thing she's had all along since she came from Georgia. Another woman said, well, we -- we'd get her another one if she needed it. Neither one of them would say, yes, this is the one that's been there all the time. We can't really say that. One woman said like when I asked her what's on

it. Nothing is on it. That would be the nurse. Or there might be some manufacture's label. Well, there is a manufacture's label. Is there any writing on it? No. But there is. Helen Sailor written twice on it. I don't know why people can't simply give the testimony that they know to be true instead of trying embellish to make an impression.

If you're called up to the witness stand and you know there's something that she keeps her drugs in, how can you conclude that it's the same thing she always has kept her drugs in? It may seem like a small point to you, but think about it. It's the bias that we get when we try to do a good thing. We know Helen. We try to do a good thing for her. I wouldn't be able to say if it's the same bin. Would any of you be able to say, yes, this is the one? How certain is that? Where did that bin come from to begin with? Was that actually always in Helen's room? Neither witness says it. Is there a alternative explanation for the fingerprint? The state has to prove that my client was involved somehow in this case, and a mere fingerprint on a bin with drugs in it just doesn't do it.

It's true that Andy and Lana were good friends.

So, even if -- even if Andy had done this murder and
gotten that bin and taken it to Lana, even if Lana had

come downstairs -- or upstairs, excuse me -- and gone into the room to help him clean up, she wouldn't be a part of the crime itself. Here's the instruction you're going to get on aiding, inducing or causing an offense.

2.0

A person knew who knowingly aids, induces, or causes another person to commit an offense, commits that offense even if the other person has not been prosecuted for the offense, has not been convicted of the offense, or has been acquitted of the offense.

In other words, it doesn't matter what happened to the other person. If you aid, induce, or cause to commit the offense, and that's the key here, because if the murder happened before the action of Lana Canen, then she didn't help to murder Helen Sailor, and we don't know. If we assume that that fingerprint on that bin was something that occurred in the apartment of Helen Sailor, we don't know when it got there. We don't know if it was before or after. I guess I explained to you before that proving something beyond a reasonable doubt means looking for holes in the evidence. And while it might be a nice thing to say, yeah, she's the mastermind, and he's the muscle, do you really think that's what happened here, and even if you do are you sure?

You're going to get another instruction and it concerns direct and circumstantial evidence. Direct

evidence means evidence that directly proves a fact without an inference and which in itself is true -- if true conclusively established that fact.

2.0

When Andy Royer says I did it, if that in itself is true that conclusively established the fact, that's direct evidence. Somebody says I saw Lana Canen go in the apartment and do the crime. That's evidence that if true conclusively establishes the fact. That's direct evidence.

Circumstantial evidence means evidence that proves a fact from which an inference of the existence of another fact may be drawn. So in this case we have the fingerprint, which is basically the evidence against Lana Canen, and we've got some statements. Those statements are not I did it. Those statements are not to a person here that testified Andy Royer killed Helen Sailor, and I told him to do that. Those statements are little bits a pieces which may lead to an inference from which another fact may be drawn. So those are known as circumstantial evidence. And it appears that the case against Lana Canen is totally circumstantial evidence because the person that said he was involved in the crime didn't mention her at all.

Now, here's the thing about circumstantial evidence. The prosecutor -- one of the prosecutors said

in the beginning that's just the same as direct evidence.

Well, it's different in this respect. Both direct and circumstantial evidence are acceptable means of proof.

Where proof of guilt is by circumstantial evidence only, it must be so conclusive and point so surely and unerringly to the guilt of the accused as to exclude every reasonable theory of innocence.

2.0

We heard in the beginning of the case that Lana knew Helen Sailor, and she admitted knowing Helen Sailor. Had she been in her apartment before? We don't know. But from the evidence, it may be an inference you can draw.

Did Andy, knowing Helen Sailor, take that drug tub down and show it to Lana? We don't know. But I believe from the evidence that they knew each other so well it may be, and it may be just as likely that that happened then that Lana was involved in the murder. What is as likely as what? And, remember, we're not weighing to see what's more likely because that only proves the case by more than 50 percent. We're talking what proves the case beyond a reasonable doubt, and that's what you have to keep in mind here.

You're going to be given an instruction on reasonable doubt. A defendant must not be convicted on suspicion or speculation. It's not enough to show that

the defendant is probably guilty. On the other hand, there are few things in the world that we know with absolute certainly. The state doesn't have to overcome every possible doubt, but the state must prove each element of the crime by evidence that firmly convinces you and leaves no reasonable doubt. The proof must be so convincing that you can rely and act upon it in the matter of the highest concern and importance to you.

2.5

Think of your life savings. How much of that would you be willing to bet on this? How much do you know about what really happened here? Can you say that Lana Canen beyond a reasonable doubt prompted that man to go up and rob Helen Sailor during which he killed her beyond a reasonable doubt? Then you're seeing a lot fewer of them than I am. I hope that you will find Lana not guilty. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Zook. Ladies and gentlemen, we have two more lawyers to hear from, and we have final instructions. For that reason, we're going to give you a short recess at this time.

You are all jurors in this case. I must tell you now. I'll repeat this again each time you are permitted to separate.

Generally, you should not express any opinion about the case before it is submitted to you for

deliberation; however, you are permitted to discuss the evidence presented in this case amongst yourselves in the jury room during recesses from trial. All jurors and alternates must be present during these discussions, and you must reserve judgment about the outcome of the case until your deliberations begin.

2.0

You are admonished that you may not discuss the facts of the case with anyone other than your fellow jurors.

You may not discuss this case with me or with the lawyers, parties or with any of the witnesses.

You should not listen to or read any outside or media accounts of the trial. You may not investigate the case or attempt to obtain information outside the courtroom. It is highly improper for you to do so. You are to consider and decide this case only upon the evidence received during the course of the trial in the courtroom. You'll be in the care of the bailiff.

(A short recess was taken.)

THE COURT: Mr. Crawford, Mr. Zook, Ms. Becker Mr. Williams we have a situation here where we have some oversized exhibits, some items that probably should not be here in storage. Does anyone object to the conclusion of trial photographing these exhibits, substituting a photograph in the record? Anyone object?

```
MS. BECKER: No.
 1
                MR. CRAWFORD: No, your Honor.
 2
                MR. ZOOK: Your Honor, only to the drug tub.
 3
                THE COURT: Yes. The rest of the items are
 4
 5
            They're not oversized. This is only thing that
      I'm thinking is oversized.
 6
 7
                MR. ZOOK: I don't mind the drugs going back --
                THE COURT: No, no. They're all going back.
 8
      That's not what I'm saying. At the conclusion of the
 9
10
      trial.
                MR. ZOOK: I understand what you're saying.
11
12
      I'm saying the drug tub itself should be preserved here
13
      as evidence.
14
                THE COURT: All right. But the contents you're
      all right with photographing those?
15
16
                MR. ZOOK: Yes.
17
                MS. BECKER: Judge, if we break the seal then
      it ruins the chain of custody --
18
19
                THE COURT: Well, he's giving up any chain of
20
      custody argument by his suggestion. Right?
21
                MR. ZOOK: Right.
                THE COURT: That solve your problem.
22
23
                MS. BECKER: Fine with me.
24
                     (The Court convened with all the
25
                     parties present. The jury entered the
```

courtroom and the following 1 2 proceedings were had.) 3 THE COURT: Be seated, please. Mr. Crawford will now address you on behalf of the defendant 4 Mr. Royer. Mr. Crawford. 5 MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you, your Honor. 6 7 CLOSING STATEMENT MR. CRAWFORD: Ladies and gentlemen of the 8 jury, I appreciate you taking the time over the last two 9 10 days to carefully listen to the evidence. That's what we spoke about when we spoke about earlier in this case when 11 12 we were picking the jury about how important it was going 13 to be to carefully listen all of the evidence. While 14 this case certainly involves the tragic death of a very nice -- or what seemed to be a very nice lady, Ms. Helen 15 Sailor, it also involves issues concerning a young man 16 with a diminished mental capacity, Andrew Royer. 17 18 MS. BECKER: Objection, may we approach. 19 THE COURT: You may. 2.0 (An off-the-record discussion was held 21 at the bench.) THE COURT: To the extent there was an 22 23 objection, it is overruled. 24 MR. CRAWFORD: What do we know about Andrew 25 Royer? We know that he was a gentleman that lived in the

highrise, and we know that he was a gentlemen that was initially questioned by police officers in this case. I believe officer -- or Detective Conway who said he spoke with him initially in this case when I believe Detective Christian was involved. You'll have to review your notes to make a determination as to specifically who was involved in that initial questioning in the case. At that point in time, nothing was learned from Mr Royer.

We know from the detectives that Mr. Royer was an individual that was a little slow, and I believe you all heard that on the tape. You certainly had an opportunity to listen to that during the course of the statements that were given yesterday that was played out before you by the State of Indiana. We certainly know that information. And again, you have an opportunity to consider that when you consider the nature and the scope of the testimony by way of the tape in this particular case.

Now, at this point in time, I'd like to take you back to November 28, 2002, and figure out specifically what we saw in the way of evidence concerning the death of Helen Sailor. What do we first know? We know from the course of the several statements from Mr. Royer that he got home at approximately four o'clock. We know that he had been at his mother's

house that day for thanksgiving dinner, and it was approximately four o'clock or so when he got home on that evening in question.

We also know from the testimony of Carol

Converse that Helen Sailor arrived home somewhere between

5, 5:15, 5:30 somewhere along that nature and that time.

I believe that she mentioned specifically that they had

watched a show that she believed went to five o'clock,

and after that they left and it took about 10, 15 minutes

to get to the highrise from their location.

Well, what's the next relevant information that perhaps was presented through the State of Indiana's case and also during cross-examination in my case, and that's through Charles Lambert? We learned that somewhere between 7, 7:15 he saw co-defendant in this case Lana Canen out in front of the highrise, and she was the one that was walking up back and forth around the front of the highrise there. That's a specific piece of information that we learned at that point in time, and Charles Lambert was very clear during cross-examination that he under no circumstances saw Andrew Royer at that point in time. Carefully, he -- it was clear that that was the only person that he had seen out at that point in time.

And what also did he see her with as well too?

I believe he mentioned a duffle bag, and he mentioned another bag as well too. She had some items with her when she was leaving the particular location at the highrise. Did you see Andrew Royer with anything at that point in time? No, he didn't. It was only Lana Canen.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

What next did we learn in the scope of events that transpired? Somewhere between 8:45 and 9:15 Caroline Hoffer called Helen Sailor's apartment I believe somewhere between eight and ten times, or six and eight. There were a relative number of periods of times that she called 8:45 to 9:15 to let her know that she was going to be coming the next morning and to follow-up with her since she hadn't seen her Thanksgiving. We also learned at that point in time that Helen Sailor never answered the telephone during that period of time. It is at that point in time that thereafter Caroline Hoffer came the next day and tried to get into the apartment of Helen Sailor or to get her to let her in but was unsuccessful. She had to call Helen's friends, family members, Larry Converse, and Carol Converse to come and open the door; and that point in time is was when Carol and everyone else discovered that Helen Sailor was dead.

Now, what happened with the Elkhart Police

Department at that point in time. Well, we heard

Detective Joel Bourdon come in and testify that he went

2.0

2.5

around with others and canvassed the apartment, and I believe you all had an opportunity to see both video and photos about what it looked like in that apartment at that point in time. And you heard Detective Joel Bourdon talk about the procedures he went about and carefully going over all of the items that he felt were relevant in Helen Sailor's apartment to attempt to pull out latent prints. You heard him testify that he did that in several areas both in the kitchen area and in the bedroom area and all around where he thought that you might find -- perhaps find a latent print. And I believe he testified, and this is very important, testified that there were no prints that were found from the defendant Andrew Royer, none whatsoever.

We learned later that the only print they found was a print of Lana Canen, the co-defendant in this case, certainly not Andrew Royer, and that's critical when you go back and look at this information in this case and make a determination. Think carefully about what they didn't find in this apartment at this point in time.

Now, we also learned that kind of the case that during that first five days of the investigation, the officers blanketed the highrise, and they wanted to get some information. So they talked to all of the residents or as many of residents as they could talk to about did

they know anything about this. Did anybody know anything about what had happened to Helen Sailor, and they talked to a number of individuals. I believe Detective Conway had indicated it was at that point in time, the original canvas time, that they had come into contact with Andrew Royer, and also I believe Detective Thayer testified it was during that point in time that they came into contact with Lana Canen.

2.0

2.5

Well, and we also heard they had spoken with Charlie Lambert, and they talking with Flo Macioce as well too, a resident of highrise. Jerome Matt Johnson, who was up there on the tenth floor, also came in and testified. He was talked to as well by the police. So everyone was being talked to by the police to the extent that they could. The police had some red flags, but they weren't certain about things, and things kind of sat on hiatus for a little while. I'm sure they didn't give it up completely, but the case didn't kind of come to any kind of conclusion at that point in time.

It wasn't until August or so of 2003 interestingly enough when we got the new homicide unit at the Elkhart Police Department, a unit devoted exclusively to resolving homicides. And as I believe Detective Daggy mentioned, this was the first case they got. So you can imagine, common sense would tell you, how much they were

pursuing this, what they were looking at, and what they wanted to prove by this. So they took all of the information that they gathered in this case, and they all had opportunity, all of them I'm sure, to carefully review this file, and consider all of the facts and all of the statements and everything that had transpired during the course of the investigation in this case and were fully equipped with information in all of their heads as to what they knew and what they knew specifically.

2.0

2.5

Now, in addition too, we can't forget the fact that in November and December of 2003, obviously, we had the highrise. There were a lot of people at the highrise. And, again, while it wasn't testified to, no one asked you to leave your common sense at home when you came here today, you can carefully think about what may have been discussed amongst the residents at the highrise, and I ask you to take that with you when you go back and deliberate in this case.

So we have the information that the police have gathered. We have the information that may have been seminated throughout the highrise that was going on at all this point in time. Next, what do we know? We know specifically that Detective Daggy and Detective Carl Conway of the Elkhart Police Department came to pick up

Andrew Royer at his home on September 3rd of 2003. Now,

I specifically asked them if they knew if he'd taken him
his medication beforehand. They said they weren't
certain, but he certainly didn't take it with him
initially to the police department. That was very clear.

On September 3, 2003, Andrew Royer of Oaklawn -receiving Oaklawn treatment did not take his medication
with him at that point in time. So it's with that in
mind you carefully listen to the statements that you
heard on the tape.

2.0

But I want to go back a little bit further in this case. And I want to talk about State's Exhibit 17.

Sorry, State's Exhibit 15. September 3, 2003 apparently contains the signature of Andrew Royer, and it's an advisement of rights section. And it's listed here at 9:35 a.m. specifically when Andrew Royer signed the advisement of rights section. Now, I believe Detective Conway, according to his testimony, had indicated that because of the nature and the situation of the individual he was dealing with here, he mentions Andrew Royer.

He took great pains to explain to discuss things with him because he knew the concerns associated with that situation and wanted to make very certain that there was nothing wrong with the course of this communication that the two of them were having. I

believe he also indicated that he called representatives from Oaklawn by phone, and they said they didn't need anybody there. He could feel free to go ahead and talk to Andrew Royer on his own. That's what he testified to so.

2.5

Okay. So over the course of the next couple of hours, approximately until 1:10, 1:20, 1:30 something of that nature, Carlton Conway of the Elkhart Police

Department had an opportunity to speak with Andrew Royer himself. Now, you heard during course of the questioning of both Mr. Zook and myself we discussed specifically with Carlton Conway whether or not the state or whether or not the Elkhart Police Department had access to video cameras, had access to audiotapes. He was very clear at that time that they did. And, in fact, today we heard from Detective Posthuma that she watched Lana Canen's initially or through a videotape that was provided by another office in the Elkhart Police Department.

Again, we know for certain that the Elkhart

Police Department had at their disposal at that time

videotape cameras and audiotapes because we certainly

heard an audiotape in this case that were at their

disposal that they could have used throughout the entire

scope of the process in this case, the whole scope of the

interrogation when they took Andrew Royer into the

station at about 9:15, 9:20, 9:30 on September 3 of 2003. That wasn't used. We don't have any specific knowledge or recorded knowledge which we could have had as to what transpired during the period of time in which Carl Conway spoke with Andrew Royer. That you will have to consider when you go back and deliberate in this case.

And one of the other things that I would ask you to do when you go back and deliberate in this case is to listen to the tapes, or is to listen to your memory to what you thought you heard and what you heard the other day specifically concerning the transaction of what took place in this particular case. Listen to the way in which Andrew Royer talks. Listen to the questioning of Carl Conway, Detective Carl Conway, listen very carefully, there are different stories, there are different things specifically about this particular situation.

Obviously, on the first date we have conversations concerning issues of money. The second day we have issues of religion. The whole thing over religion. Doesn't make any sense if you listen to all that, and you all had an opportunity yesterday and today to carefully think about that, and you'll have an opportunity to carefully think about that when you go back and deliberate. See what does and doesn't make

sense when you go back and deliberate because it isn't all there. And that's exactly what the State of Indiana has suggested as well too is you have to piece it together, but I'd say don't do that. Take and listen to the whole scope and the statement of what you specifically hear here under these circumstances.

2.0

2.5

And you have to ask yourself when you go back what you heard from the tape is this is the kind gentleman that is thinking that quickly to go pull a towel out to clean up an area, to go through that whole apartment, to take all those precautions so there's nothing left? Because we heard on the stand at least there were no confirmable prints or nothing that they could tie specifically to Mr. Royer. Both the shoe print, both the fingerprint, and any other sort of evidence whatsoever. The other only thing we heard that came from was that medicine cabinet, or that medicine jug over there because it had Lana Canen's fingerprint on it and not Andrew Royer's. That's what you heard. Nothing else.

Now, does that gentleman strike you as one -from what you heard on the tape, what you were able to
perceive based upon all the evidence that was presented,
as a gentleman that could think quickly, could move and
react like that to clean up a scene, to do all these

things, to take all these necessary steps, to do it on his own, in such what would appear to be a pretty short period of time.

2.5

We know that between 8:45 and 9:15 Caroline
Hoffer was under -- was not being able to reach Helen
Sailor, and we know that she returned somewhere between
5:15, 5:30 or so. Within that period of time, that
gentlemen was going to think about all of these things
and all of a sudden just decide, oh, I might as well just
go kill Helen Sailor? No. It just isn't there. It just
doesn't make any sense from what you heard. It just
simply is not there. So go back and carefully analyse
and look at those statements in tune with also looking at
what you see in the apartment itself too.

One of the other things I caught as well too when he said -- when the detective said, well, yeah, he talked about taking her jewelry, getting that out of her jewelry box. Well, that didn't look like jewelry box to me. No, it didn't. And then he also said, or it was discussed I believe by Detective Bourdon, that there were items that were found in there in Ziplock bags. Well, if you're going to take some of it, why are you not taking all of this stuff? There's still stuff apparently in there. It just doesn't make any sense for him to talk like that and to have taken those particular items when

you still have stuff that's still in the jewelry box.

It's those things that you got to wrestle with when you go back and deliberate.

2.0

2.5

He also I believe mentions the C and L Pawnshop that he said he took Andrew Royer to the store because this is where Andy said apparently he took the items to pawn to get money. There was no record from Mr. Royer.

No record whatsoever of Mr. Royer ever taking anything to the pawnshop to sell, nothing whatsoever. It just isn't there. It just doesn't make any sense.

When you consider all of this information together and when you carefully look at it and when you tear it apart, and that's what I'm asking you to do because we told you this wasn't going to be an easy case. When you tear it apart and when you look at it, it simply doesn't make any sense. Yes. I know there's going to take time for you to go back an deliberate and look at what's was said because, yeah, that's a difficult burden. I can imagine, and I know that's an insurmountable thing for everybody to look at when you have a confession. I understand that completely. I'm just asking you to pull it apart and take a look at it when the rest of it just doesn't make any sense because it isn't always as clear as the state would have you believe about little the little things that only Mr. Royer could have known. It

just isn't there. Think about it, and go back and look at it and carefully weigh it.

The other thing that I thought interesting too was in the other statement, the second statement, Andrew said that he would conversate with Helen Sailor, talk about religion. Well, that would explain how he might have some knowledge about where things might have been in the apartment. He'd conversate with her. They'd talk. About religion. He could know where certain items were, where they were located, because he would have seen them if he had been in there. That you can consider when you go back and deliberate and look at all the facts in this case. Those are important pieces of information that you have to take a look at and make a decision about when you go back and wrestle with these issues.

Remember, importantly, that within the course and the period of time that Elkhart Police Department had their new homicide unit, within a month they had solved this case, and you can imagine it was important for them to do this. This was a pretty lingering case. Remember also that there was a ten month window of opportunity that people could have been talking about the facts of this particular case. The highrise has a lot of people in it. There are a lot people that live there, could have known certain facts and certain information about

this case.

Additionally too, take a careful look at the fact that throughout the entire apartment area there were no prints, no hair, no feet prints or marks for Andrew Royer; and obviously he's a pretty big gentleman, had some pretty big size shoes. I think they would have seen that if those items -- if he shoe prints in there.

Weren't there. Nothing physically to tie Andrew Royer to that particular apartment. It just doesn't make sense when you pull it all apart and look at it, and that's what I'm asking you to do when you go back and deliberate. And I again thank all of you for your time in this, and I ask that you find you find Andrew Royer not guilty. Thank you.

THE COURT: Counsel approach, please.

(An off-the-record discussion was held at the bench.)

THE COURT: Mr Crawford.

MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you, your Honor. While it is true, ladies and gentleman, that diminished capacity itself is not a defense to murder, and I do understand that. I only ask, and again, it is not a defense, I only ask that you carefully consider the factors of the things that you heard up here in this stand about Mr. Royer when you make determinations concerning the nature of the

statement itself and whether it adds up. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Williams.

2.5

CLOSING STATEMENT

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, at the beginning of this case we talked about this being a senseless killing of a 94-year-old woman for money. I think we have to add something to that after you've heard the evidence. This was a brutal senseless killing of a 94-year-old woman for money. Mr. Zook talked about -- he said there was no evidence -- no evidence tying Lana Canen to the crime in this case. The state has shown nothing. Just a fingerprint. Just a fingerprint. Lana Canen said she was out of town when this murder occurred. She told that to numerous people. She told it to Judy Johnston, she told it to Detective Snider, and we know that's not true because Flo Macioce and Charlie Lambert saw her there.

She said, "I was never in the apartment." Not only was I out of town. I was never in the apartment.

Oops. There's a fingerprint, a fingerprint that puts her in the apartment. No evidence. She's not telling the truth about being in town. She's seen outside the apartment complex at 6:45 on the evening of Thanksgiving pacing back and forth. She sees a person come in. Hey,

can you give me a ride. I need to get out of here.

That's what she's saying. She's got her Marlboro bag,
and she's off to her boyfriend's.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

Fingerprint. Even when confronted with it, she says, well, where was it. It was on the medication. Well, if it was on a pill bottle, I open up pill bottles a certain way. I never said it was an pill bottle. Lana Canen didn't think that that print would be found because they wiped down the evidence after Helen was killed. Andrew Royer told you, "We got the towels, I have them, I'm wiping down the area." That's what they did. They covered up their tracks. We told you that this was a mentally sophisticated event. Planning, execution of a robbery, the killing. Took brute force. It was Andrew Royer, and then the cover up occurs. Taking the keys out off the key ring to lock the door as you leave, wiping down prints, taking her body into a different room, throwing things in the trash. You'll go back and you'll know from the evidence that Andrew Royer didn't have the mental sophistication to come up with those things. It was Lana Canen.

Lana Canen also gives you the statement from

Nina Porter. Nina Porter doesn't come up with, you know,
a statement like some vendetta against her saying, oh,
she told me that she robbed and she murdered the woman.

She tells you these things that she really didn't understand at the time. She didn't know -- Nina Porter didn't know about Helen Sailor's murder until after she was interviewed, and she told the detectives at the police department what the statements were, and then they filled her in on the significance.

2.0

What did she say -- she gave, with regard to

Lana Canen, they when, the who, the what, the result and
the plan. On Thanksgiving there's an old lady going to
get money from her. I can get money from her. She has
the audacity to refuse. They gave death. Andrew Royer
was there. He did things Lana Canen wanted him to do.
Go stand out in the rain for 30 minutes. Okay. Andrew,
I'm not getting the money. He's there. What does he do?
Come off some of that money. Bam. Smacks Helen. Down
she goes. She says -- she shares religion with people.
She's a religious person. You do not know what you do as
she's talking to Andrew, and that sets him off. He's
angry.

Mr. Crawford said, well -- well, the two statements don't make sense. If they don't make sense, the first one is about money and then the second one is about religion. They do make sense. It's just that he didn't give it all in one statement. Helen was in there fighting for her life and preaching to him, and it made

```
him angry. Mr. Crawford said something. There's no --
nothing -- no physical evidence that links my client to
the apartment. What about Helen Sailor's neck as he took
the lanyard and he twisted it five to ten minutes as
Dr. Prahlow said. There's a space where you would twist.
Andy, how did you do that as Detective Conway says,
grabbed it, twisted it. I think that's some physical
evidence that he left her neck as he cut off the oxygen
supply as the blood pressure rose in her head, and she
had no ability to breathe, and it took time five to ten
minutes.
```

2.0

Lana Canen, Mr. Zook said is not the brains.

There's no evidence of the brains or being the mastermind. You heard Andrew Royer. He was not the brains, wasn't the mastermind. He was the brawn. Lana's plan is in her statement. No one was supposed to get hurt. We went there to get money, things went wrong.

But what we ultimately do? We got our money out of the Bible, we got some jewelry as Andrew said, and off we go.

Not the brains. She had the ability to control Andrew Royer as Nina Porter told you, and she did that.

Mr. Zook talks about the plastic bin. I wish the witnesses would tell the truth. I wish they could just do that. Well, Caroline Hoffer said that since 1997 when Helen moved back, she had never seen another

container. As far as she could remember, she had never seen another container. Erika Roarhig, more specifically, said I treated -- or was with her for two years from Thanksgiving of 2002, go back two years.

Thanksgiving of 2000, two years she cared for her.

Filled the bin many times. Was not mistaken about the bin. That's the bin. It was the same the entire time that she cared for her, cared for Helen.

2.0

Mr. Zook said something about, well, the -- the things that were sprinkled on -- the juice that was sprinkled on Helen. We don't know who did that. Not my client. Speculation. Talk about speculation. That somehow there's -- there's no evidence that this bin left the apartment went down, somehow found it's way to his client, and then found it's way back up. Talk about speculation. That's pure speculation.

Andrew Royer didn't move into the apartment complex until 2001. So it wasn't as like, you know, he had a bin that he gave -- got from Lana and they gave to Helen or something like that. He wasn't even living there at the time that Erika Roarhig began care.

Now, with respect to Mr. Royer, you have his statements. His statements, "I strangled Helen to death." There's your physical evidence. "It was a money thing. She just happened to be the victim." And he gave

intimate details. Mr. Crawford said, well, there's no fingerprints. Andrew Royer tells you. Got the towels, and I wiped down everything I could. Detective Bourdon said the way that you can not have fingerprints is when you put your hand down it moves. Not necessarily you can be somewhere and not leave fingerprints, especially when you wipe them up.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Crawford also talked about the information disseminated throughout the highrise that these -- the people that lived there the elderly and the -- the mentally physically challenged must have received and came up with and then disseminated all that information and said, Andy, this is what happened, then Royer goes in and then talks to Conway and gives this version that he heard from the highrise. The officers in this case told you that they don't disseminate the information for that exact reason. Detective Conway said I didn't give any information because I knew he wasn't mentally sophisticated. I called and checked with Oaklawn to see if I should go forward. They said fine, but he got on the stand and told you specifically, I didn't do those things because I didn't want to plant things in Andrew Royer's head. If you listen to the statement, he gives intimate details that would not have been disclosed to the public. Certainly would have been disclosed to him.

What intimate details? Bible that he went through took the money, it's where they got the money, they towels that he used to clean up, the way that strangulation occurred. No one would ever have known how the strangulation in detail occurred other than the examination by Dr. Prahlow, the twisting of a lanyard, and the result asphyxiation and death.

2.0

The jewelry box that Andrew Royer talked about, there it is, that he struck Helen in the face and the bruises, that he transferred the body to the bedroom.

Detective Conway, what did you do with the body after you strangled Helen? I drug her into the bedroom with the lanyard around her neck making the marks back and forth where he deposits her. That information wasn't disseminated.

Medication, Mr. Crawford talked about medication. Well, he wasn't on his meds. In his statement, in Andy Royer's statement, he says, "I'm on Paxil." Conway talks to him about. Yeah. I'm taking my medication. First statement, taking my medication.

Starts the preinterview at 9:30 goes to 1:30, it's four hours, then he takes a 23 minute statement with Andrew Royer. And what does Conway do. He sees that he's getting mentally fatigued, so he doesn't push on to try to get more. He takes that into consideration and he

stops. Gives him the time to rest, and they go get his medication so that he has it on two day.

2.0

So what happened on day two? Don't talk about day two, Mr. Crawford doesn't talk about day two as far as the medication. He comes back and tells you again that he strangled her and gives intimate detail in day two.

The first statement and the second statement when taken together do make sense. They do make sense.

As the plan was to go get the money, according to Lana Canen, from the old lady Helen, Helen Sailor. And when she refused and she had the audacity, is when Andrew Royer was unleased. They got their money, they took their things, they did what they needed to do they thought to cover up the scene, and they got out of there.

One of the things that you have when you go back into the jury room is your life experience and common sense. If you count up all your years of your common sense and life experience, it's about 550 years.

This we said at the beginning was going to be a puzzle, and you didn't know what the puzzle was at the beginning because you didn't have any evidence so you didn't have the box top. Based on the evidence, now you have the box top to this murderer's puzzle, and it's a collage not just a single picture. It has Helen Sailor

sitting there alive. It has the events that you heard about on the 28th of November 2002, and the events of the 29th of November, 2002, and it has two faces on it.

Those faces are Andrew Royer and Lana Canen who are responsible for the brutal senseless killing of a 94-year-old woman for money. And we ask that you find Andrew Royer and Lana Canen guilty of felony murder.

Thank you.

2.0

2.5

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Williams. Ladies and gentlemen, the bailiff is going to furnish each of you with a copy of the Court's final instructions. The court will then read the final instructions.

You are to consider all the instructions that are given to you as a whole and you are to regard each with the others given to you.

Do not single out any certain instruction, sentence, or any individual point and ignore the others.

The Court has previously given you your preliminary instructions on certain matters of law which were to be considered during the trial, and now gives you your final instructions on the law which are to be considered along with the preliminary instructions in arriving at your verdict.

For trial today is a criminal case bought by the State of Indiana against Andrew M. Royer and Lana R.

Canen. The case was commenced when an information was filed charging the defendants with Murder, a felony.

That information, omitting formal parts, reads as follows:

2.0

"The undersigned affiant swears that on or about the 28th day of November, 2002, at the county of Elkhart, State of Indiana, one Andrew M. Royer and one Lana R. Canen, and they and each of them, did knowingly kill one Helen Sailor, another human being, by strangling the said Helen Sailor, while committing robbery, and as a direct and proximate result of the strangling as aforesaid, the said Helen Sailor was fatally wounded, and the said Helen Sailor did languish and die in said county and state on the 28th day of November 2002; all of which is contrary to Indiana Code section 35-42-1-1; contrary to the form of the statute in such cases made and provided; and, against the peace and dignity of the State of Indiana."

To this information the defendants have entered pleas of not guilty.

Upon the issues thus joined the burden rests
upon the State of Indiana to prove to each of you, beyond
a reasonable doubt, every essential elements of the
charges contained in the information or of any offense

included therein.

2.0

The information which has been filed against the defendants is merely the formal method of charging them, and the charges must be proven by the evidence introduced during this trial.

The statute defining the offense of murder which was in force in Indiana at the time of offense charged reads (in pertinent part) as follows:

"A person who (1) kills another human being,
(2) while knowingly committing or attempting to
commit robbery, commits felony murder, a felony."

The statute defining the offense of robbery which was in force in Indiana at the time of the offense charged reads (in pertinent part) as follows:

"A person who knowingly or intentionally takes property from another person or from the presence of another person:

- (1) by using or threatening the use of force on any person; or
 - (2) by putting any person in fear;

Commits robbery, a class C felony. However, the offense is class B felony if it is committed while armed with a deadly weapon."

You should give separate consideration to each defendant. Each is entitled to have his or her case

decided on the evidence and the law which is applicable 1 to him or her. 3 Any evidence which is limited to one defendant should not be considered by you as to any other 4 defendant. The crime of felony murder is defined by 6 7 statute as follows: A person who kills another human being while 8 committing or attempting to commit robbery, commits 9 10 felony murder, a felony. To convict a defendant, the State must have 11 12 proved each of the following elements: 13 The defendant killed Helen Sailor while 14 knowingly committing or attempting to commit robbery. If the state failed to prove each of these 15 elements beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find that 16 17 defendant not quilty. If the state did prove each of these elements 18 beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find that defendant 19 2.0 guilty of felony murder, a felony. 21 A person who knowingly aids, induces, or causes another person to commit an offense, commits that 22

offense, even if the other person:

23

24

25

2. has not been convicted of the offense; or

3. has been acquitted of the offense.

2.0

2.5

A person is responsible for the acts of his or her accomplice as well as his or her own. The acts of one person are attributable to all who are knowingly acting together during the commission of the crime.

Accordingly, the state need not prove, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant personally and acting by himself or herself, committed all of the elements of the crime or crimes with which he or she is charged. However, the state must prove, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant and another person or persons, acting together, committed all of the elements of the crime with which he or she is charged.

It is not necessary for the state to show that a defendant was a party to a preconceived scheme; it must merely show concerted action or participation in an illegal act by the defendant.

You are instructed that although it is true that mere presence is not enough to show a person's participation in a crime, such presence may be considered with all other evidence to determine guilt. A trier of fact my infer participation from a defendant's failure to oppose the crime, companionship with one engaged therein, and a course of conduct before, during, and after the offense which tends to show complicity.

Knowingly is defined as: A person engages in conduct knowingly if, when he or she engages in the conduct, he or she is aware of a high probability that he or she is doing so.

Under the law, you must presume that each defendant is innocent and you must continue to believe that they are is innocent throughout the trial, unless the state proves that any defendant is guilty, beyond a reasonable doubt, of every essential element of the crime charged.

Since each defendant is presumed to be innocent, he or she is not required to present any evidence to prove his or her innocence, or to prove or explain anything. If, at the conclusion of the trial, there remains in your mind a reasonable doubt concerning a defendant's guilt, you must find him or her not guilty.

It is your responsibility as jurors to reach your verdict based solely upon the evidence presented in the trial. You are instructed that the filing of charges against the defendant, his or her arrest pursuant to such charges, and the fact that a defendant is here being tried in a court of law, is not evidence, and may not be considered, even in the slightest degree, as indicating his or her quilt.

You are entitled to draw all reasonable

inferences that naturally and legitimately flow from the facts proven, and you are entitled to consider such inferences in reaching your verdict.

2.0

You are the exclusive judges of the evidence, the credibility of the witness, and of the weight to be given to the testimony of each of them. In considering the testimony of any witness, you may take into account their ability and opportunity to observe; their memory, manner, and conduct, while testifying; any interest, bias, or prejudice they may have; any relationship with the other witnesses or interested parties; and the reasonableness of their testimony considered in the light of all the evidence in the case.

You should attempt to fit the evidence to the presumption that each defendant is innocent and to the theory that every witness is telling the truth. You should not disregard the testimony of any witness without a reason and without careful consideration. However, if you find that the testimony of a witness is so unreasonable as to be unworthy of belief, or if you find so much conflict between the testimony of witnesses that you cannot believe all of them, then you must determine which of them you will believe and which of them you will disbelieve.

In weighing the testimony to determine what or

whom you will believe, you should use your own knowledge, experience, and common sense gained from day-to-day living. You may find that the number of witnesses who testify to a particular fact or on one side or the other or the quantity of evidence on a particular point, does not control your determination of the truth. You should give the greatest weight to that evidence which convinces you most strongly of its truthfulness.

2.0

2.5

The burden is upon the state to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that each defendant is guilty of the crime charged. It is a strict and heavy burden. The evidence must overcome any reasonable doubt concerning each defendant's guilt, but it does not mean that a defendant's guilt must be proved beyond all possible doubt.

A reasonable doubt is a fair, actual, and logical doubt based upon reason and common sense. A reasonable doubt may arise either from the evidence or from a lack of evidence. Reasonable doubt exists when you are not firmly convinced of a defendant's guilt, after you have weighed and considered all of the evidence.

A defendant must not be convicted on suspicion or speculation. It is not enough for the state to show that a defendant is probably guilty. On the other hand,

there are very few things in this world that we know with absolute certainty. The state does not have to overcome every possible doubt.

2.0

The State must prove each element of the crime by evidence that firmly convinces each of you and leaves no reasonable doubt. The proof must be so convincing that you can rely and act upon it in this matter of the highest importance.

If you find that there is a reasonable doubt that a defendant is guilty of the crime, you must give the defendant the benefit of that doubt and find that defendant not quilty of the crime under consideration.

While it is necessary that every essential element of the crime charged against the accused should be proven by the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, this does not mean that all incidental facts must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

You must consider all of the evidence as a whole and must not single out any particular fact or circumstance.

A fact or circumstance considered apart from other evidence may be weak, if not improbable, but when viewed in connection with surrounding facts and circumstances, it may be so well supported as to remove all doubt as to its existence.

No defendant may be compelled to testify. A defendant has no obligation to testify.

2.0

2.5

The defendants did not testify. You must not consider this in any way.

Failure to oppose a crime is not alone sufficient to sustain a conviction under the theory of aiding, inducing, or causing an offense.

Direct evidence means evidence that directly proves a fact, without an inference, and which, in itself, if true, conclusively establishes that fact.

Circumstantial evidence means evidence that proves a fact from which an inference of the existence of another fact may be drawn.

An inference is a deduction of fact that may logically and reasonably be drawn from another fact or group of facts.

It is not necessary that facts be proved by direct evidence. Both direct evidence and circumstantial evidence are acceptable as a means of proof. Where proof of guilt is by circumstantial evidence only, it must be so conclusive in character and point so surely and unerringly to the guilt of the accused as to exclude every reasonable theory of innocence.

I submit this case to you with the confidence that you will faithfully discharge the grave duty resting

2.0

upon you, bearing in mind that the liberty of the accused is not to be trifled away nor taken by careless or inconsiderate judgment; but if after a careful consideration of the law and the evidence in the case you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty, you should return your verdict accordingly. Duty demands it and the law requires it. You must be just to a defendant and equally just to the state. As upright men and women charged with the responsible duty of assisting the Court in the administration of justice, you will put aside all sympathy and sentiment and look steadfastly and alone to the law and the evidence in the case and return into court such a verdict as is warranted thereby.

During the progress of the trial, certain questions may be asked, certain exhibits may be offered which the Court may rule are not admissible into evidence. You must not concern yourselves with the reasons for the rulings since the production of evidence is strictly controlled buy rules of law.

You must not consider an exhibit or testimony which the Court does not admit or orders stricken from the record. In fact, such matter is to be treated as though you had never heard of it.

Nothing that I say during the trial is intended

as any suggestion of what facts or what verdict you should find. Each of you, as jurors, must determine the facts and the verdict.

2.0

The Court is sometimes asked by the jury to answer questions which arise during jury deliberations. However, this Court's experience has been that the answers to most questions can be found in the evidence presented during the trial and the jury instructions given to you by the Court.

If questions arise during your deliberations that you wish to have answered by the Court, then the questions are to be in written form and given to the bailiff who will bring them to me. I will then consult with the attorneys in this case and determine if the question can be answered under the law.

Questions can be answered:

- (1) only if the Court and the attorneys agree that they would be answered, and;
- (2) only if the attorneys and the Court agree on the answer to be given.

Under the law, seldom can jury questions be answered. If questions are submitted, we will answer the questions or we will advise you that the questions cannot be answered under the law.

In criminal cases the Constitution of Indiana

gives the jury the right to determine the law as well as the facts, and it is my duty to instruct you concerning the law. You should pay respectful attention to the law contained in these instructions. You should give the law a fair and honest interpretation and should not ignore or disregard the law without a substantial reason. However, in reaching your final decision, you have the right to determine the law and the facts which will govern your verdict.

2.0

Your verdict must represent the considered opinion of each juror. In order to return a verdict, you must all agree, your verdict must be unanimous.

It is your duty, as jurors, to consult with one other and to deliberate with a view to reaching an agreement if you can do so without violence to individual judgment. Each of you must decide the case for yourselves but do so only after an impartial consideration of the evidence with your fellow jurors. In the course of your deliberations, do not hesitate to re-examine your own views and change your opinion if convinced it is wrong, but do not surrender your honest conviction as to the weight or effect of evidence based solely upon the opinion of your fellow jurors or for the mere purpose of returning a verdict.

If you should fail to reach a decision, this

case will be left open and undecided. Like all cases it must be disposed of at some time. Another trial would be a heavy burden on both sides.

2.0

There is no reason to believe that the case can ever be tried again any better or more exhaustively than it already has been. There's no reason to believe that more evidence or clearer evidence would be produced on behalf of either side.

There is no reason to believe that the case would ever be submitted to twelve people more intelligent, more impartial, or more reasonable than you. Any future jury must be selected in the same manner that you were.

This does not mean that those favoring any particular position should surrender their honest convictions as to the weight or effect of any evidence solely because of the opinion of the other jurors or because of the importance of arriving at a decision.

This means that you should give respectful consideration to each other's view and talk over any differences of opinion in a spirit of fairness and candor. If at all possible, you should resolve any differences and come to a common conclusion so that this case may be completed.

From time to time during the trial, it became

necessary for me to talk with the lawyers out of the hearing of the jury, either by having a conference at the bench when the jury was present in the courtroom, or by calling a recess and hearing arguments on the law as it applies to this case. I apologize to you for having to keep you waiting during those times, but I'm sure you can understand the necessity to do so. The purpose of those conferences was not to keep relevant information from you, but to decide how certain evidence was to be treated under the rules of evidence and to avoid confusion and error in the trial of this cause.

2.0

It is both the duty and obligation of the attorney for each side to object when the other side offers testimony or other evidence which the attorney believes is not properly admissible. Counsel also have the right and duty to ask the Court to make rulings of law and to request conferences at the bench out of the hearing of the jury when necessary. All of those questions of law must be decided by the Court. You should not show any prejudice against either party because the attorney objected to the admissibility of evidence or asked for a conference out of the hearing of the jury or asked the Court for a ruling on the law because it is their duty to do so.

As I have already indicated, my rulings on the

admissibility of evidence do not, unless expressly stated by me, indicate any opinion as to the weight or effect of such evidence. You are the sole judges of the credibility of all witnesses and of the weight and effect of all evidence.

2.0

It will be necessary that all of you remain together until you are discharged by the Court. The bailiff will be in charge of you until you are discharged by the Court. During your deliberations, you must not communicate with anyone, except to answer such questions as may be asked of you by the bailiff under the direction of the Court. If, at any time, you desire to communicate with me, you should notify the bailiff.

When you retire to the jury room, you will first select a foreperson, who will then preside over your deliberations. When you have agreed upon your verdict, you will have it dated and signed by the foreperson. You will then notify the bailiff, and she will arrange for your return into the courtroom.

I will send the final instructions and exhibits to the jury room with you. They are to be returned by the foreperson to the Court when you have reached your verdict. When you are returned to the courtroom, you will give the instructions, the exhibits, and verdict to the bailiff. The foreperson will not read the verdict in

open court.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

I'm also sending the alternate jurors to the jury room during deliberations. The alternate jurors are specifically admonished and advised at this time that they are only entitled to listen to the deliberations of the jury and are specifically prohibited from participating in any of the deliberations by the jury and are also specifically prohibited from voting with the jury. Any alternate juror is permitted to take part in the discussions and voting only in the event one of the regular members of the jury should be discharged for some reason and an alternate juror be needed to comprise a total of twelve. The foreperson of the jury is specifically admonished that in presiding over the deliberations, that it is his or her responsibility to see that the alternate juror does not participate in any of the deliberations or voting. The alternate juror shall only be permitted to listen to the deliberations by the regular members of the jury. You will now be in charge of the bailiff. Mrs. Jackson, would you come forward, and raise your

right hand.

(The bailiff was sworn.)

THE BAILIFF: Yes.

THE COURT: Mrs. Jackson, I'm going give you a

```
1
      folder. In this folder you will find the final
      instructions, the original set, the original set of
 2
 3
      preliminary instructions, and two verdict forms. We will
      assemble the exhibit make them available to you. Ladies
 4
      and gentlemen, at this time you may take your notebooks
      with you, and you will at this time retire to deliberate.
 6
      You'll be in care of the bailiff.
 7
                     (The jury exited the courtroom at
 8
                     5:36 p.m.)
 9
10
                THE COURT: All right. This is State of
      Indiana versus Andrew Royer, State of Indiana versus Lana
11
12
      Canen. In Mr. Royer's case 03-MR-155, Ms. Canen's case
13
      04-MR-118. Each defendant appears with their respective
14
      counsel. Mr. Williams appears on behalf of the State of
      Indiana. Ms. Canen, would you raise your right hand.
15
                     (The defendant Lana Canen was sworn.)
16
17
                MS. CANEN: So help me God.
                THE COURT: Tell me your name.
18
19
                MS. CANEN: Lane R. Canen.
2.0
                THE COURT: Mr. Royer, raise your right hand.
                     (The defendant Andrew Royer was
21
22
                     sworn.)
23
                MR. ROYER: Yes, I do.
24
                THE COURT: Tell me your name, sir.
25
                MR. ROYER: Andy Royer.
```

THE COURT: All right. We have the jury deliberating at this time. They have been deliberating for approximately one half an hour. This case is scheduled for a bifurcation; that is, there will be a second part with respect to the aggravators. It is my understanding from discussions with counsel that all counsel and all defendants have agreed to dispense with the Smylie Procedure in this case. It is also my understanding that each defendant is going to admit the existence of certain aggravators which the Court may consider at the time of sentencing.

2.0

The Court will also consider any mitigators at the time of sentencing, and the Court will then weigh the aggravators admitted against the mitigators together with any criminal history, if any, each defendant has. The Court will then impose a sentence that is appropriate in the Court's opinion. Now, this is all, of course, predicated and conditioned upon a defendant being convicted. If the defendant Royer or the defendant Canen is found not guilty, of course, these proceedings will be meaningless in that event. So far is that correct, Mr. Zook?

MR. ZOOK: Yes sir.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Crawford?

MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, your Honor.

```
THE COURT: And, Mr. Williams?
 1
 2.
                MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, your Honor.
 3
                THE COURT: And, Ms. Canen, is that your
      understanding?
 4
                MS. CANEN: Yes.
                THE COURT: And, Mr. Royer, is that your
 6
 7
      understanding.
                MR. ROYER: Yes, sir.
 8
                THE COURT: Ms. Canen, under the Constitutions
 9
10
      of the State of Indiana and the United States of America,
      you may have the right to require proof beyond a
11
12
      reasonable doubt of the existence of certain aggravators.
13
                Now, in your case, the state has alleged the
14
      existence of some aggravators. Those aggravators are the
      risk that you will commit another crime, nature and
15
16
      circumstances of the crime, defendant's character and
17
      condition, prior criminal history not reduced to
      conviction, the fact that you may be in need of
18
19
      rehabilitation or correctional treatment best provided in
2.0
      a penal facility, the fact that an imposition of a
21
      reduced or suspended sentence would depreciate the
      seriousness of crime, the fact that the victim of the
22
23
      crime was less than 12 years of age or at least 65 years
24
      of age, the fact that the victim of the crime was
25
      mentally or physically infirmed.
```

There are additional nonstatutory aggravators:
The defendant shows a lack of remorse, the offense involved a violation of a position of trust and confidence, additional uncharged acts not brought by the state, defendant shows a lack of remorse, defendant shows contempt for the laws of the state and the United States of America. Those are the ones that alleged. There may be others. Now, you may have the right to require proof of these aggravators I've just told you about other than criminal convictions which you may which the Court may consider in enhancing your sentence over and above the presumptive sentence for this offense if you're convicted. Do you understand that?

MS. CANEN: Yes, sir.

2.0

THE COURT: If the Court accepts this stipulation that you're making here today, you won't have a trial on the aggravators, and the Court will consider the aggravators agreed to, mitigators found in the presentence report, any additional written material submitted by the parties, and evidence presented at your sentencing hearing held in this case. Consequently, if the Court accepts this stipulation, you'll be giving up the right you may have to require that aggravators considered by the Court in sentencing you be found to exist by this jury. Do you understand that?

```
MS. CANEN: Not really but --
 1
                THE COURT: All right. Do you understand you
 2
 3
      can have this jury determine whether or not any of these
      alleged aggravators exist?
 4
                MS. CANEN: Yes.
                THE COURT: Okay. And what I'm asking you is
 6
 7
      do some of these aggravators exist in your case?
                MS. CANEN: Two, seven and eight.
 8
                THE COURT: Two, seven and eighth of the
 9
10
      statutory aggravators.
                MS. CANEN: Yes, sir.
11
12
                THE COURT: So, two, the nature and
13
      circumstances of the crime. You want me to consider that
14
      in deciding whether I should impose an aggravated
15
      sentence?
16
                MS. CANEN: Yes, sir.
17
                THE COURT: And you're admitting that the
      victim was 94 years of age. Is that correct?
18
19
                MS. CANEN: Yes, sir.
2.0
                THE COURT: And you're also admitting that the
      victim utilized a walker and had some vision problems and
21
      was physically infirmed. Is that correct?
22
23
                MS. CANEN: Yes, sir.
24
                THE COURT: I don't believe there's any
      evidence she was mentally infirmed, is there?
2.5
```

```
MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor.
 1
                THE COURT: No. All right. And you're
 2
 3
      admitting those statutory aggravating circumstances,
      Ms. Canen?
 4
                MS. CANEN: Yes, your Honor.
                THE COURT: All right. Do you understand we
 6
 7
      can have the jury determine whether they exist, or you
      can admit the. Do you understand that?
 8
                MS. CANEN: Yes, sir.
 9
10
                THE COURT: And do you want to admit them
      rather than have the jury determine them?
11
12
                MS. CANEN: Yes, I do.
13
                THE COURT: And are you willing to waive any
14
      right you may have to require that the existence of
      aggravators considered by the Court in sentencing you be
15
      proved beyond a reasonable doubt to this jury?
16
                MS. CANEN: Yes, your Honor.
17
                THE COURT: All right. And, Mr. Zook, two
18
      seven and eight are the statutory aggravators you and
19
2.0
      Mr. Williams and Ms. Becker have agreed upon?
21
                MR. ZOOK: Yes, sir.
                THE COURT: And, Mr. Williams, is that correct?
22
23
                MR. WILLIAMS: That's correct, your Honor.
24
                THE COURT: And you want me to accept this
25
      stipulation, Ms. Canen?
```

```
MS. CANEN: Yes, your Honor.
 1
                THE COURT: And Mr. Zook.
 2
 3
                MR. ZOOK: Yes, sir.
                THE COURT: And Mr. Williams.
 4
                MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, your Honor.
                THE COURT: I will do so. And in your case,
 6
 7
      Ms. Canen, we will vacate the Smylie Procedure, and we
      will sit here, and we will wait until the jury comes back
 8
      with a verdict. If they find you not guilty, of course
 9
10
      you'll be released, and that will end these proceedings.
      If they find you guilty, at the time of sentencing the,
11
12
      Court will consider those aggravators that you have told
13
      me about, two, seven and eight, statutory aggravators.
14
      Understood?
15
                MS. CANEN: Yes, your Honor.
16
                THE COURT: Do you have any questions about
17
      this procedure?
18
                MS. CANEN: No, sir.
19
                THE COURT: All right. Mr. Royer, you
20
      understand you're also under oath here today?
21
                MR. ROYER: Yes.
                THE COURT: And you also understand that you
22
23
      can have a trial here with this jury on the existence of
24
      aggravators.
25
                MR. ROYER: Yes.
```

Statutory aggravators in your case, there's a risk you'll commit another crime, the nature and circumstances of the crime committed, your character and condition, fact that you're in need of correctional or rehabilitative treatment that can best be provided by commitment to a penal facility, the imposition of a reduced or suspended sentence would depreciate the seriousness of the crime, the victim of the crime was less than 12 years of age or at least 65 years of age, in this case, 94 years of age, and the victim of the crime was mentally or physically infirmed. You understand that?

MR. ROYER: Yes.

2.0

THE COURT: There are nonstatutory aggravators.

One, it is alleged you show a lack of remorse; and two,
the offense involved violation of a position of trust and
confidence in the community with respect to the victim.

Did you understand that?

MR. ROYER: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Mr. Royer, you have the right to have the jury determine whether or not these aggravators exist other than criminal convictions or criminal history which you may have which the Court would consider to enhance your sentence if you're convicted in this offense. The Court cannot impose the sentence above the

```
presumptive sentence unless these aggravators or admitted
 1
      or found by a jury. Do you understand that?
 2
 3
                MR. ROYER: Yes.
                THE COURT: All right. Are you admitting the
 4
      existence of any of these aggravators?
 5
                MR. CRAWFORD: Two, six and seven, your Honor.
 6
 7
                THE COURT: Your counsel tells me two, six and
      seven you are admitting, Mr. Royer, is that correct?
 8
                MR. ROYER: Yes, that is correct.
 9
10
                THE COURT: You're admitting the nature and
      circumstances of the crime may be considered by me in
11
12
      determining whether or not I should impose an aggravated
13
      sentence. Is that correct?
14
                MS. CANEN: Yes.
                THE COURT: And you're telling me I can also
15
16
      consider the fact that the victim was 94 years of age as
17
      an aggravator and the fact that the victim used a walker
      and had some eyesight problems. Is that correct?
18
19
                MR. ROYER: Yes.
2.0
                THE COURT: All right. We can have a jury
      determine whether these aggravator exist, or you can
21
      admit them here today. Is it your desire to admit them
22
23
      here today?
24
                MR. ROYER: Yes.
                THE COURT: And the Court will consider the
25
```

```
existence of these aggravators in the event you are
 1
      convicted. If you're not convicted of this offense, you
 2
      will be released from custody and that will end the
 3
      matter. Understood?
 4
                MR. ROYER: Yes.
                THE COURT: All right. If you admit these
 6
 7
      aggravators here today, you'll be giving up the right to
      have the jury determine the existence of the aggravators.
 8
      Do you understand this?
 9
10
                MR. ROYER: Yes.
                THE COURT: Do you want to admit these
11
12
      aggravators and give up your right to have the jury
13
      determine whether they exist?
14
                MR. ROYER: Yes.
                THE COURT: Are you willing to waive any right
15
16
      you have to require the existence of aggravators
17
      considered by the Court in sentencing you be proved to
      this jury beyond a reasonable doubt?
18
19
                MR. ROYER: Yes.
2.0
                THE COURT: And same question for you,
      Ms. Canen, are you willing to waive any right you have to
21
      require that the existence of aggravators considered by
22
23
      this Court in sentencing you proved beyond a reasonable
24
      doubt to this jury?
25
                MS. CANEN: Yes, your Honor.
```

```
THE COURT: All right. Mr. Zook, are you
 1
      satisfied with the record and admission?
 2
 3
                MR. ZOOK: Yes, sir.
                THE COURT: Mr. Crawford, are you satisfied
 4
      with the record and admission?
 5
                MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, your Honor.
 6
 7
                THE COURT: And, Mr. Williams, are you
      satisfied with the record and the admission?
 8
 9
                MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, your Honor.
10
                THE COURT: Court will vacate the bifurcation
      in each of these two case as a result of the defendants'
11
12
      admission of aggravators. There will not be a bifurcated
13
      trial. We will sit, we will wait, we will see what the
14
      jury does. If the jury convicts either defendant or both
      defendants, the Court will consider only the aggravators
15
      admitted by them except for the existence of any prior
16
17
      criminal history. Anybody have any questions?
18
                MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor.
19
                MR. ZOOK: No, sir.
2.0
                MR. CRAWFORD: No, your Honor.
                THE COURT: All right. That will be all.
21
                     (The Court convened with all the
22
23
                     parties present.)
24
                THE COURT: State of Indiana verses Andrew
25
      Royer, 03-MR-155; State of Indiana versus Lana Canen,
```

```
1
      04-MR-118. Each defendant appears, counsel for each
      defendant appears, counsel for the state appears, other
 2
 3
      persons appear in the audience section. Ladies and
      gentlemen, I'm going address my comments to all of you
 4
      including those of you in the audience section, the jury
      as indicated they've reached a verdict. What we're going
 6
 7
      to do is bring the jury into the courtroom. I will make
      inquiry of the jury as to whether or not they have
 8
      reached a verdict. If they do, by the foreperson,
 9
10
      indicate they've reached a verdict, we'll have the
      verdict given to the bailiff. She'll give it to me.
11
12
      it is in appropriate form, I will read the verdict at
13
      that time. Counsel will address any motions at that
14
      time. Out of respect for the jury, I do not want any
      emotional outbursts from anyone in the courtroom.
15
16
      Everyone understand? Defendants.
17
                MS. CANEN: Yes.
18
                MR. ROYER: Yes.
                THE COURT: Those of you in the audience
19
20
      section everyone understand. Counsel, are you ready?
21
                MS. BECKER: Yes.
22
                MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, your Honor.
23
                MR. ZOOK: Yes, sir.
24
                     (The jury entered the courtroom, and
25
                     the following proceedings were had.)
```

```
THE COURT: Be seated, please. I will address
 1
      my comments to the foreperson of the jury and ask that he
 2
      speak on behalf of other jurors. Mr. Foreman, has the
 3
      jury reached a verdict?
 4
                A JUROR: Yes, we have, your Honor.
                THE COURT: With respect to each case?
 6
                A JUROR: Yes, we have, your Honor.
 7
                THE COURT: All right. Would you deliver the
 8
      verdict form to the bailiff. She will deliver it to me.
 9
10
      Court notes the evidence has been returned. The Court
      has examined each verdict form, finds each verdict form
11
12
      to be in proper form. Court will read the verdict.
13
                State of Indiana versus Andrew M. Royer
14
                Verdict: We, the jury, find the defendant
      Andrew M. Royer quilty of felony murder, a felony. Dated
15
      this tenth day of August 2005 signed by the foremen. Any
16
      motions?
17
                MS. BECKER: State moves for judgment on the
18
      verdict.
19
2.0
                THE COURT: State has moved for entry of
      judgment on the verdict. Judgment will be entered
21
      accordingly finding the defendant guilty of Felony
22
23
      Murder, a felony.
                State of Indiana versus Lana R. Canen
24
25
                Verdict: We, the jury, find independent Lana
```

```
R. Canen quilty of felony murder, a felony. Dated this
 1
      tenth day of the August, 2005. Are there any motions?
 2
                MS. BECKER: Thank you, your Honor. The state
 3
      moves for judgment on the verdict.
 4
                THE COURT: Judgment of finding of quilty
 5
      felony murder will be made with respect to Ms. Canen.
 6
 7
      Court will order a presentence report. With respect to
      each defendant, sentencing will be scheduled September 8
 8
      if that is agreeable with all counsel.
 9
10
                MS. BECKER: Your Honor, a representative of
      the victim's family is unavailable September 8. Could we
11
12
      do it either the week before or the week after?
13
                THE COURT: September 1 we can do it then.
14
                MS. BECKER: Thank you.
                THE COURT: Mr. Crawford Mr. Zook, September 1
15
16
      work for you?
17
                MR. ZOOK: That's fine.
                THE COURT: September 1, 8:30. A presentence
18
      report will be ordered. Bond will be revoked.
19
2.0
      defendant will be remanded to the custody of the sheriff.
                Ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank you for
21
      three long days here in the Elkhart Circuit Court. I
22
23
      very much appreciate your service. This is a very
24
      important case as is every case that goes to trial. I
```

appreciate your attentiveness. I appreciate your

25

willingness to work long days. This system that we have, 1 2 criminal justice system in this county and this state simply does not work without people such as yourselves 3 willing to give up a little bit of their own time. 4 I want to personally thank you for your service 5 6 here. As I told other jurors, I'll tell you the same, you may not serve for two years. You may claim exemption 7 if you wish. If you feel the need to serve again, we 8 will accommodate you here between now and the year end. 9 I'm going to come back to the jury. I'll try to answer 10 any question that you may have. Thank you very much. 11 12 Once again, you'll be in care of the bailiff. 13 (No further proceedings were had in this matter on this date.) 1415 16 17 18 19 2.0 21 22 23 24 2.5

IN THE ELKHART CIRCUIT COURT 1 STATE OF INDIANA) SS: COUNTY OF ELKHART CAUSE NO: 20C01-0409-MR-00118 2) 3 4 5 6 CERTIFICATE 7 I, Ann S. Hunsberger, do hereby certify that I 8 am the Official Court Reporter of the Elkhart Circuit 9 10 Court in the above matter, and the foregoing pages constitute a true and accurate transcript of the 11 testimony given at said time and place. 12 I certify that the same was reduced to 13 typewritten form from my original stenograph notes and/or 14 15 electronically recorded equipment by Computer-Aided 16 Transcription. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand 17 18 and seal this 12th day of December, 2005. 19 20 21 Hunsberger Official Court Reporter 22 Circuit Court 101 North Main Street 23 Goshen, Indiana 24 25